

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

---

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF  
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

---

EDITED BY THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

---

VOLUME XX.



COLUMBUS, OHIO:  
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.  
1900.

# INDEX.

## NUMBER 1.

	PAGE
What is the Motive to do Right? By PROF. M. LOY, D. D., Columbus, Ohio .....	1
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN D. D., Columbus, Ohio.....	10
The Significance of the Altar. By REV. W. E. SCHRAMM, Allegheny, Pa .....	24
The Lafayette of the Reformation. By PROF. A. PFLUEGER, A. M., Columbus, Ohio.....	31
Criticism: True and False. Translated by REV. W. E. TRESSEL.	42

## NUMBER 2.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.....	65.
How to Secure More Students for Our Colleges. By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.....	74
The School of the Reformation. By REV. R. C. H. LENSKI....	86
Criticism: True and False. Translated by REV. W. E. TRESSEL.	102
Old Testament Chronology in the Light of the Monuments. By REV. G. FINKE.....	114
Funeral Sermons .....	119, 124

## NUMBER 3.

Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M .....	129
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.....	137
Criticism: True and False. Translated by REV. W. E. TRESSEL.	146
Funeral Sermons. Sketch by REV. L. H. BURRY, A. M.....	168
Biblical Finds and Recent Discussions. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D .....	170
The Pastor and His Greek Testament. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D .....	183
The Biblical and Other Deluge Stories.....	189
Notes .....	191



## NUMBER 4.

	PAGE
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D. ....	193
The Council of Constance. By PROF. E. PFEIFFER, A. M. ....	205
Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M. ....	224
What Great Men Think of the Bible. ....	229
Prisca, the Author of Hebrews. ....	254
Notes. ....	255

## NUMBER 5.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D. ....	257
The Central Theological Problem of the Day. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D. ....	267
Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M. ....	274
Pastoral Visitation of the Sick. By REV. WALTER L. SPIEL- MAN, A. B. ....	278
Funeral Sermon. By REV. L. H. SCHUH, PH. D. ....	286
The Converting Grace of the Holy Spirit and the Transitive Conversion of the Sinner. By REV. PAUL S. L. JOHN- SON, A. B. ....	289
Recent Biblical Research. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE PH. D. ....	312

## NUMBER 6.

The Sabbath Principle in Our Christian Church Year. By REV. C. B. GOHDES, A. M. ....	321
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D. ....	338
The Educational Problem in the Joint Synod. By REV. J. SHEATSLEY. ....	347
Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M. ....	358
Jung Stilling—And Rationalism. By REV. J. C. SCHACHT, A. B. ....	363
Progress and Problems of New Testament Research. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D. ....	369
Notes. ....	375

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

---

Vol. XX.

FEBRUARY, 1900.

No. 1.

---

## WHAT IS THE MOTIVE TO DO RIGHT?

BY PROF. M. LOY, D.D., COLUMBUS, O.

An apology seems necessary for putting such a question and troubling our readers with an answer. To them the matter may appear so plain that any elucidation of it might be regarded as a mere waste of words, if not a mystification of it that is worse. Our apology is, that after all, some do not see so clearly, and that perhaps some who feel no need of light on it may, if they will read on, find some help in their conflict with sin and Satan. At any rate we have no intention to mystify the matter, but only wish to make it plainer in its bearing on the Christian life.

To begin with, it must be borne in mind that people's notions of right do not always agree with each other, and that their motives for doing what appears to them right are not always the same. Some things will seem right to a heathen which to a Christian seem utterly wrong. Upon these differences it is not our purpose to enter in this article. Our question pertains to the motive of doing the right as we see it. What we have especially in view is the fact that even Christians are subject to different motives in this respect, and may suffer loss by the prevalence of some to the detriment of others. Right doing is not always righteousness. That is to say, we may do what is generally recognized as right without having hearts that are fully in accord with the right which the action seems to express. The motive and the appearance do not exactly correspond, though the act seems right, and therefore the motive looks right. Hence there is a righteousness in one sense that in another and in a most important sense is no righteousness at all. When a person does a seemingly noble act

for the ignoble purpose of ultimately injuring his neighbor, the act seems right, while the motive is certainly wrong. What appears generous is often really base. Hence it is so easy to pass uncharitable judgments on the conduct of our neighbors, and hence the importance of learning and heeding the eighth commandment, which requires us to put the best construction on their actions. The outwardly good act may be inwardly bad. Love forbids unnecessarily to consider it bad when it appears good, but it may be bad notwithstanding. Let us always think it good when it looks so, unless the evidence otherwise presented shows that it is not.

But the fact remains, that men's actions which seem good may have a source that is bad. The charity which requires that we judge our neighbors as meaning things as they look, requires that we judge ourselves as we are. It should not seem strange that a distinction is made. We can see our neighbor's actions, but not the motives that produce them; we can see our own motives and are guilty of folly when we interpret them by the appearance of our actions. If we have bad motives, our conduct is bad, however it may look; and it is stupidity to allow ourselves to be deceived by that which may deceive others, who cannot see into our hearts as we can ourselves. When we speak of the examination of motives we of course have reference to our own hearts, of whose activities we are conscious, not to the hearts of our neighbors, into which neither our sense nor our consciousness can penetrate, and in regard to which we are therefore forbidden to judge. We write with the purpose simply of aiding in self-examination, not at all to afford any solace to those who uncharitably question the motives of others.

Our readers are no doubt acquainted with the old adage, that honesty is the best policy. It certainly is. Though temporarily it may suffer defeat, ultimately it will win. Not all acknowledge this. A large portion of the business community still thinks that success depends on scheming, and duplicity, and tergiversation, that is not strictly honest. They pursue success without reference to the moral character of the means by which they expect to attain it. That they are not Christians need not be especially remarked. What they want is gold, whether God wants them to have it or not, and they have their terrible reward. But there are others who are convinced that business prospers best when there is no deception practiced—

when there is no lying about the quality of the goods, no cheating in weights and measures, and no advantage taken of the ignorance of the customers. We hold that they are right, though business men have more than once told the writer that their experience proves us to be wrong. Those who give fair work at fair wages, and fair goods at fair prices will not fail to win in the end, though they may have to pass through many a trial before the end is reached. God favors the upright man; and men, even though they should care little for uprightness themselves, would rather deal with men whom they can trust. Honesty is the best policy. But if a man has little concern about right or wrong, and concludes to do the fair thing merely because this in his estimation pays best, how then? There is no use in trying to deceive ourselves by arguing that that makes no difference. Evidently at heart he is not honest, and his seemingly honest dealing does not make him honest. His object is to make money, not to serve the Lord by doing right, whether this result in making money or not. His heart is not right, and all his work in pursuance of honesty as a policy will result in a shame. He seeks the appearance of honesty to attain his selfish ends in the love of money, while the substance of honesty is lacking in his lack of a higher love of righteousness. In the mind of a true Christian, policy can never be the right motive to do right.

Frequently the example of others is mentioned as a guide. When this is done by Christians it is obvious that they mean the example of good people. Members of our church need not be told, that there are bad as well as good examples presented by men. Of course, when Christians speak of others who may be regarded as models, and think of their lives as offering motives to imitate them, they have Christian examples in view. The thought that we should follow the fashion, which is sometimes right and sometimes wrong, sometimes rational and sometimes absurd, cannot justly be imparted to believers who know that they are not to be conformed to this world. It is examples of holy men that are meant. Their lives allure us to holiness. And yet this allurements may prove a snare. Good men too have their failings, and the argument that a man generally recognized as good did a certain thing and therefore it must be right, is a plain fallacy. He was capable of erring, and in that special case he may have done wrong. We have no safeguard in such cases but the Word of God, which is our guide in all cases. To that we must always appeal,

whatever good men may have said or done. That other men recognized as good have done this or that, is no proof that they have done right; and following any human model without regard to the Word is dangerous. There is only one example that is absolutely perfect, and that is the example of our blessed Savior. We make no mistake when we learn of Him, not only in His doctrine but also in His life. But besides this there is no perfect example, and the true motive to do right can therefore never be that this or that admirable person did the thing in question. Following persons in disregard to the Scripture teaching is perilous, and when we have no motive for doing right but that some famous men have done it, our foundation is insecure and our righteousness belongs to the same class as that of the Scribes and Pharisees.

Even the desire to obey the divine law as revealed in the Holy Scriptures is not of necessity the right motive to do right. Let the reader not misunderstand us. We do not say that it cannot be. It may be. But it is possible that it is not. In many cases it is not in fact, and therefore in the Christian's self-examination it is dangerous to overlook the possibilities. It is quite possible that one who has been led to a knowledge of God's law as obligating him to the performance of certain duties, perceives the necessity of compliance with the demands made upon him, though his heart is not at all in harmony with the requirements. Indeed, that is always the case when the law has done its first work upon the conscience. But neither the law nor the conscience can change our corrupt nature. Naturally we are what sin has made us, whilst conscience continues to stand for righteousness as God originally made us. So it comes that the law continually appeals to our conscience, even if our sinful hearts are not in accord with it. And so it comes also that our reason strives to adapt our conduct to the legal requirements, even though these sinful hearts of ours rise in rebellion against it. The result is that form of righteousness which is illustrated in the Pharisees, but which lacks the substance, because the heart is not in harmony with the right apparently performed. The work of righteousness is done, and that is all. The person who does it is the unrighteous person that he was before, and his work has not produced the least change in him. He conforms to the law in his actions, but in his soul he is not in harmony with the law and has no interest in its fulfillment. He recognizes the claims of righteousness, though he is not

righteous, and therefore strives to satisfy these claims by doing the works which it requires. This work seems right. But Christians are not satisfied with that. They want a righteousness which is better than that of the Scribes and Pharisees. The law does show us the right way, and every believer in Christ is glad that he has it for his guidance. We shall always do the right thing when we comply with its requirements. But we are now speaking of the motive to do the right thing. A person who does it only because the law demands it and is afraid of the punishment to which disobedience subjects him, has not the right motive. If the law were not given, and if the penalty were removed, he would probably not do what the law prescribes. Something else would be more in accord with his inclinations, and perhaps more in accord with his judgment as to what would be really conducive to his welfare. He is not righteous, though with a view to his own comfort he does the works of righteousness. One who is really in harmony with the right does it because it is right, whatever the consequences may be. Hence the Christian is not under the law, because in the power of faith he follows after holiness, whether any law required it or not. His heart is in harmony with the holy law, and therefore he lives in daily repentance, because he daily sees not only his conflict with the law, but with his own personal purposes and designs.

Hence it is evident that nothing can furnish the right motive for doing right but the grace of God which makes us new creatures and works in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure. Phil. 2, 13. "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we shall walk in them." Eph. 2, 10. The imaginations of the thoughts of our hearts are only evil continually by reason of the sin that has come upon us. Naturally this evil that is in us supplies the motives of action, whether this action seem good or bad. Only when by grace we have the righteousness of God by faith does the heart become purified and the motives become right.

Our article, in addition to impressing the moral principle of the Holy Scriptures, and thus of the moral nature of Christianity, has a twofold particular purpose in view. One is that Christians should not deceive themselves by the good appearance of things and persons around them; the other is that they should not allow themselves to be deceived by the good appearances in others. Our reason for refer-

ring only to Christians is obvious. Those who are not believers in Christ have neither the motive to do right which the Holy Spirit gives, nor the rule to measure right which the Holy Scriptures present, and can therefore not be expected to appreciate the one or the other. They must be approached in a different way, the object of which must be not to change their judgment on their present basis, but to convert them to Christ and thus furnish them with a sure foundation of which by nature and reason they know nothing. The additional remark may be permitted, though not essential to the aim of our discussion, that because they know nothing of the basis on which the final judgment shall be pronounced, in our land mostly because they want to know nothing of it, they are entirely incompetent to judge of righteousness by the rule of the divine Word, by which all nations and people shall be judged with a final and everlasting judgment on the last day.

In the practical lessons we assign the first place to the requirements made by the truth of revelation in this regard on the children of God themselves. They should "examine themselves whether they be in the faith," as the Scriptures exhort. They may be called Christians when they are not, and the fact that they do works which all good people approve does not establish the fact; they may think themselves Christians, because they perform deeds which our Lord commands, and do this even with a notable degree of self-denial. Neither the judgment of others nor their own judgment can raise them from the kingdom of darkness into Christ's kingdom of light. If you do fast twice in the week and give tithes of all that you possess, how is that going to atone for your sin or, in spite of it, to render you acceptable to God? Does that pay your infinite debt to the Divine Majesty, against whom you have sinned? To a Christian it cannot be doubtful, however it may seem to the natural man, that mere formal observances cannot fulfill the requirements of divine righteousness. The actions are not the man, of whom the requirement is made. No one is a Christian because he does such works as Christianity recognizes. Christianity regards the outward work as right, when this conforms to the divine law; but its power and its claims are not realized when only that is offered. It wants more—a great deal more—so much more that this external observation, that may seem its fulfillment, presents itself as a pitiful pretence. Even men, when they once know that the professions of fellow men, put forth in word

or work, are heartless and hollow, have little respect for those who bring such a sham before the public: they inwardly despise it, though outwardly, when they find it tributary to their interest, they may praise the hollow performance. We need not say that to God the whole insincere operation is an abomination. He wants the man, not merely his actions, and never will take shows and shams as a substitute for the reality of service. He wants faith, first of all, that through the merits of His own dear Son we may have the righteousness that alone can avail before Him, and thus rejoice in the hope of glory without any merit of our own and without any claim but that in the mercy of God revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures salvation is promised and secured to us in Christ, without any money or any price on our part. If that faith is wanting, which of necessity rules out all notions of the meritoriousness of our own works, and renders all thought of the accomplishment of God's will by outward actions as a fancy as stupid as it is in conflict with all the truth of divine revelation, everything is wanting that can make any work acceptable to God; for whatsoever is not of faith must needs be sin, though it put on the form of righteousness; because it lacks the one thing needful to render the person righteous. Let us not forget that it is the person that is dealt with on the judgment day. Whatever circumstances, as we regard them, may have to do with the decision of questions as to the sincerity and uprightness of persons, and whatever considerations of justice and charity may influence our decisions in regard to human actions and human persons, let us not forget that God judges the heart into which our judgment cannot penetrate, and that therefore our poor judgment can have no standing and no voice on the last day, except so far as we have been guided by the Word of Scripture, according to which, as the proclamation of the Judge of all the earth, the final judgment shall be pronounced. How important it is therefore to examine ourselves whether we be in the faith, as the Holy Spirit admonishes us! Let us not deceive ourselves with the thought that we are righteous when we do the work that the law of righteousness prescribes. The Scriptures do tell us that "he that doeth righteousness is righteous." 1 John 3, 7. But let not the rest of the instruction given in that connection be overlooked, and therefore the words of the apostle be wholly misunderstood. What is there taught us is that men deceive themselves when they think that they can be Christians without regard to the law



of the Lord. No man can be his own master when he by faith in Christ becomes a servant of God. That very faith renders him a subject to the Lord who bought him, and gave to the slave of sin his liberty and his power. In that faith he embraces the righteousness of Christ, and in the power of that faith he doeth righteousness. Without that all is vain and void. Let him not think that he is a true believer when he is not one of those who are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2, 10), and therefore is not concerned about doing righteousness. But let him not think either that he is doing righteousness when he imitates its forms, and even scrupulously performs the legally prescribed actions, while his heart is not in them and they are foreign affairs to his inner life. "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith, prove your own selves." 2 Cor. 13, 5. It is only needful to remark yet on this point, that this examination, if it is to be Christian at all, must be according to the Word of God, which shall judge us on the last day. Christianity knows no other rule.

But there is a second lesson which our subject teaches, and which is of equal importance. It pertains to our relations to others. If the individual had nothing to concern himself about but himself, he could justly say that other people must mind their own business as he minds his, and that he has nothing to do with their affairs. But that is not the way that God designed men to live and the selfish man, if his notions were put into practice, would soon convince himself—alone, forsaken, miserable, helpless—that his way is the way of wretchedness and folly. We are meant by our Creator to live together and to help each other. If only the law of Christian love and helpfulness were better understood and practiced! But whether there be few or many who appreciate it, it is the rule by which Christians are called and empowered and admonished to live, and by which their judgments of their fellow men's actions must be formed. Whether a man professes to be a Christian or not, his rule is to judge charitably, though all the circumstances may be such as to confine his judgment within the sphere of civil righteousness. But that is the point which makes it so urgent upon Christians not to permit appearances to blind them and deceive them. When actions conform to the divine law, they seem right. When these are performed by a professed Christian, we in charity decide that they are works of Christian faith and love produced

by the power of grace. When they are performed by a person who makes no Christian profession, but asserts his purpose to do right as by nature he is able to see the right, we in charity give him credit for all that he claims and place his works in the category of civil righteousness. But further than this sincere believers in Christ cannot go without proving recreant to their faith and to their love and to their hope. They are willing to take each one at his word, so long as his actions do not contradict his professions and convict him of deception, and are thus willing to judge each one according to his own professions. But the judgment must be by the standard which God gives us in Holy Scripture. Christians can rightfully recognize no other rule of faith and life, and so far as any of them do recognize any other they have themselves to that extent departed from the only rule, and imperilled their own souls by such departure because to that extent they have for themselves rendered the foundation of their own faith and life uncertain, and as far as their influence goes have rendered it uncertain to others, whose souls are thus equally endangered. Therefore Christians cannot admit that the work of the natural man, though it outwardly be the same as that which the law requires and the Holy Spirit moves believers to do, must be the same; and that the humanitarian projects and performances of societies, secret or otherwise, that do not even claim to proceed from faith in Christ and to be dependent on the power of the Holy Ghost, are the same as the work of the Church. The effect, and in many cases the purpose, of such confusion is to break down the partition walls between nature and grace, and give the glory to man which belongs to God alone. In the process of human thinking the consequence of this is always to minimize the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which alone a soul can be saved, and to magnify the worth and efficacy of human works in the matter of salvation, when in such circles the question about that arises at all, the whole drift being to make man self-sufficient for time and eternity. How then can Christian charity consent to place the operations of men, who do not even claim to be dependent on the power of divine grace, in the same category with the humble deeds of love which are done by poor sinners who know their sin and unworthiness, and glorify the grace of their Lord who has saved them and given them faith which is the victory that overcomes the world? Evidently Christian people would blunder just as much and just as

perilously, if they pronounced other people Christians simply because they do works that accord with the law, as if they assumed that they are Christians simply because they do such works.

Let us Christians, believing the Bible and led by the Spirit of God, who by the Bible leads believers into all truth, be honest men, who in all cases and in all respects apply the revealed principles of truth and righteousness.

## THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,  
COLUMBUS, O.

### CHAPTER XI.

THE DIVINE PROMISES WITH REGARD TO ISRAEL ARE BEING  
FULFILLED.

A. *The Remnant of Believers, to whom the Promise in reality only refers, is Saved, though the Obstinate Majority is Hardened and Lost: Verses 1-10.*

The inference that some might feel inclined to draw from the last verses of the preceding chapter, namely, that God had altogether cast away His Old Testament people, so that henceforth no one could be saved, would be an erroneous one, entirely improbable in itself and refuted already by the example of Paul himself, who, although a genuine Israelite in the strictest sense, not simply a proselyte, had become not merely a Christian in general, but even one of the most prominent apostles (1). And how could God have rejected His former people in this sense, seeing that He chose it in the full knowledge of its nature and future conduct? Is it possible that He should have chosen a

V. 1. *λέγω*: Paul states in his own words an erroneous conclusion that others might draw. *οὕτως*: therefore, in seeming accordance with what has been stated, viz. 10, 18 sqq. *μή* presupposes a negative answer. *ἀπόστατο*: emphatic. *ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν οὗτοῦ*: emphatic juxtaposition. It is preposterous to assume that the true God (*ὁ θεός*) would altogether cast away those whom He had made His people. *μή γένοιτο*: comp. 9, 14. "For also I am an Israelite": "I", emphatic; "Israelite", comp. 9, 4.

people of which He foreknew that, when at last the Messiah should have come from its own midst, it would in *all* its members reject Him? Or, if these arguments should not be deemed sufficient, does not the history of Elijah (1. Kings 19, 10-18), when he had to appear before God as the accuser of his own people, show that even when His people had become so depraved and wayward that not one true servant of God seemed to be left, the Lord had preserved a number of them (2-4)? And thus also now a remnant has been left that receives Christ; and this because God in His grace made a selection consisting of those that, notwithstanding the obstinacy of the great majority, suffered themselves to be led to Christ in true faith (5). This being an election of grace, as a matter of course, all merit of

V. 2. The direct negation of the question in verse 1, the same expressions being used in the same position. *ὅν προέγνω*: whom He foreknew, and hence chose and loved notwithstanding all its foreknown defects and frailties (comp. 8, 29). "Or": comp. 6, 3. "In Elijah": in the passage that treats of Elijah; emphatic position because of Elijah's prominence. *Ἐντροχάνειν*: here construed with *κατὰ* c. gen.: to accost, address against a person (comp. a different construction 8, 27. 34); the dative (*τῷ θεῷ*) denotes the person that is addressed.

V. 3. The complaint of Elijah in a free reproduction of the Septuagint rendering of 1 Kings 19, 10. 14.

V. 4. "But": though Elijah seemed to be right in claiming to be the only one left to serve the Lord. *Χρηματισμός*: divine response, oracle. The citation is a free rendering of 1 Kings 19, 18. *Οἵτινες*: people of such a character that they have not bent a knee (*γόνυ* singular). *Τῇ Βάαλ*: dat. commodi (honoris); comp. 14, 11. In the Septuagint some copies have the feminine article, as here (*τῇ*), others the masculine (*τῷ*), which latter is the usual one in that translation. The most probable explanation of the feminine article is that the idol was considered androgynous, combining both sexes.

V. 5. "So therefore": in conformity with that Old Testament experience. "According to an election of grace": to be construed with *γέγονεν*: such a remnant of children of God among the Jews has come into existence, and exists, in accordance with an election based not on natural descent or human merit, but on divine grace apprehended and appropriated, as God in His omniscience knows, by faith. This also proves that divine grace has not altogether and absolutely been taken away from the Jews; if that were the case, grace could not be the determining principle of the election made.

human works, all human claims are excluded; for merit of work and grace exclude each other mutually (6). Consequently, what has happened to Israel must be understood in this way, that as a people they have not obtained what they sought for, namely righteousness, and this because they did not seek for it in the way appointed by God but according to their own self-righteous notions; only the remnant obtained it by faith in Christ, the others being given over to the hardening of their own hearts (7; comp. 9, 18). Thus already Moses (Deut. 29, 4) and Isaiah (29, 10) had to lament for their own times and to predict in a still higher degree for the times of the Messiah a continual moral stupidity, blindness, and deafness of Israel that can be regarded only as a divine punishment for their wilful resistance to the saving grace of God (8). Also David,

---

V. 6. "But if by grace", viz., the remnant is in existence (*γέγονεν*). The same clause must be supplied after "no more of works". "No more" is here to be understood logically: you can no longer say; not temporally. *Ἐπεὶ*: since (if it were otherwise); comp. 3, 6. *Γίνεται*: proves, shows, manifests itself (comp. 3, 4). Grace would have to change its very nature if it were to divide the honor of saving men with meritorious works of men. And just as little can a work be meritorious if grace is the efficient cause. This is expressed by an addition to this verse that is found in some manuscripts of note, and which in literal translation reads thus: "But if of works, it is no more grace, since (otherwise) the work is no more a work." We share the opinion of those who look upon these words as an addition made by some copyist that thought they were needed for the logical completion of the verse.

V. 7. "What then?" viz., is the conclusion to be drawn from what has been set forth. *Ἐπιζητεῖ*: is seeking for, striving after; *τοῦτο*: this very thing, viz. righteousness that avails before God — a tragical result, though self-inflicted. "The election" = the elected (the abstract for the concrete) = the remnant. "The rest": those not belonging to the elected = the majority of the people, the nation as such. "Were hardened" (*ἐπαρώθησαν*): comp. 9, 18, where *σκληρύνω* is used in the same sense. Their wilful resistance to God's will and Word (10, 21) was the cause of this hardening; their not obtaining the true righteousness was *not* the result of a hardening irrespective of their conduct towards the grace offered them.

V. 8. The citation is a free use of the Septuagint translation of Deut. 29, 4 combined with a part of Isa. 29, 10. "Stupor": insensibility, insusceptibility, upon which no salutary impression

in the person of the Messiah whose type he was, predicts (Psalm 69, 23 sq.) that the very thing the Jews gloried in and feasted on, the law and its external observance, would in their self-righteousness prove a snare for them and a cause of their fall, and that this would be the just punishment for their obstinate rejection of Christ (9): spiritual blindness and the pressing burden of the calamity they brought down upon themselves (10).

B. *The Rejection of the Jews Benefits the Gentiles, and the Conversion of the Gentiles is again to Benefit the Jews:* Verses 11-16.

The people of Israel had stumbled in a grievous manner by rejecting the Messiah; but it would be a mistake to draw from their consequent hardening the conclusion that the divine purpose with regard to it was their eternal fall and damnation. On the contrary, God so used their trespass that on account of it the gentiles so much the sooner received the preaching of the Gospel and by it salvation

can be made. *Τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν* (*ἀκούειν*) can grammatically be the genitive of quality modifying *ὀφθαλμούς* (*ᾠτα*): eyes (ears) of not seeing (hearing) = unfit to see (hear); it may also be the genitive of the infinitive denoting purpose: eyes (ears) of a perverse quality, in order that they may not see (hear). The original text does not decide the question, nor does the Septuagint translation, both having a different form of expression. The latter construction, being found also in verse 10, may for that very reason be deemed preferable, though the former, in itself as well as after *πνεῦμα κατανύξεως*, is more natural. "Up to the present day" (the adverb *σήμερον*, being placed between article and noun, is used, like an adjective, as an attribute): these words belong to the citation and are entirely applicable to the time of which Paul was speaking, that of the New Testament.

V. 9. Again a free citation. "Their table": that which is their joy and delight, their honor and glory. "May it become, turn into, a snare and a trap, or net" (*θῆρα*, a hunting, figuratively, a means of destruction), "and a stumbling block" (*σκάνδαλον* originally the trap-stick on which the bait is fastened, hence figuratively also a means of destruction). To these figurative expressions is then added the proper one: "and a recompense", a punishment. The multiplicity of expressions is to emphasize the idea conveyed by each one in its own way.

V. 10. "In order that they may not see": comp. verse 8. "And their back bend together continually": treat them as slaves bent down by their burden without any hope of relief.

(Acts 13, 46); and the conversion of the gentiles again was intended to incite the Jews to jealousy, so that they might the sooner be ashamed of their conduct toward the Messiah and return to Him in true faith. So their rejection of Christ, which certainly had reversed the divinely intended order of the salvation of the human race, according to the gracious will of God was to serve the salvation of both gentile and Jew (11). And what a blessing would the final conversion of the Jews be! If in the providence of God their trespass and consequent loss of grace served to make the gentiles rich in grace and salvation, how much more would the world be benefited by the reparation of this loss in the conversion of the Jews (12). As Paul is in a special

---

V. 11. "I say therefore": comp. v. 1. Also as to the force of the interrogative *μή* and the expression *μή γένοιτο* comp. v. 1. *Παράπτωμα*: falling away or aside, trespass, transgression, sin; here the wilful and obstinate rejection of the Messiah. *Τοις ἔθνεσιν*, sc. *γέγονεν*: has come. This does not mean that if the Jews had received the salvation obtained by Jesus Christ, the heathen would not have been offered and given it at all; for that would be contrary to the most direct statements of this very Epistle (e. g., 1, 14. 16; 3, 28 sqq.; comp. Gen. 3, 15; 12, 3).

V. 12. *Δέ*: furthermore. After the clause ending with *ἐθνῶν* there is to be supplied *γέγονεν*: has come to be. *Εἰ* coupled with the indicative expresses a condition for the sake of making it the basis of an inference, without stating whether the condition is fulfilled or not; here the context shows that it is. The question is in our verse, first, what is the meaning of *ἥττημα* and *πλήρωμα*, secondly, what verb has to be supplied in the last clause. "*ἥττημα* (a word not found in classical authors, but used by the Septuagint Isa. 31, 8 and by Paul, besides our present passage, 1 Cor. 6, 7; from *ἡττάμαι*, to be less, defeated, worsted) may be rendered "loss"; but that can in itself be understood in a twofold sense, namely, loss as to number, and as to position and standing. Likewise the opposite, *πλήρωμα*, means "fulness"; but that again may refer either to number or to position. In verse 25 it has the former signification; and that could incline a person to take it here in the same sense. But then evidently *ἥττημα*, following *παράπτωμα* is most naturally understood as resulting from it and hence taken in the sense of loss of position and grace, which then necessarily determines its opposite, *πλήρωμα*, as meaning the reparation of that loss, the restitution to that position and grace. As to the verbal form to be supplied in the last clause that depends upon the interpretation of this whole chapter and especially vv. 25 sq., namely, whether the future conversion of Israel as a nation or

sense the apostle of gentiles, he wants them properly to understand his relation to the Jews. As apostle of gentiles he indeed is intent upon glorifying his office by faithfully performing its duties in preaching the Gospel to gentiles (13); but this must not be understood to mean that he no more cares for the Jews, his own people according to the flesh. On the contrary, even in preaching the Gospel to gentiles in order to bring them to faith and salvation his desire and intention is at the same time to incite his own people to jealousy and thus to lead them to Christ, though he is conscious of not being able to accomplish much in this respect (14). For what a blessing would the conversion of the Jews be to the world! If by the grace of God the rejection of them brought about the reconciliation of the gentile world with God by having the Gospel preached to them, would not their reception by God in consequence of their coming to faith in Christ bring about a new spiritual life in the Church, all its members being mightily aroused by it to glowing zeal in the service of their Lord and God (15)? And that such a conversion is still possible, must

---

only the gradual one of individual Israelites is found predicted here. If the latter view is correct the form *γένοιτ' ἄν*: *would become*, viz., riches of the world, or of the heathen, is the proper one; if the former, *γενήσεται*: *will become*. As the reader will notice, the former view is expressed in the above explanation. The reasons will be given in connection with the interpretation of vv. 25 sq.

V. 13. "In so far as I now indeed am an apostle of heathen": *μὲν* presupposes a following *δὲ* introducing on the other side his interest in, and sympathy with, the Jews, his countrymen, which thought is, however, not directly expressed, but intimated in verse 14. *Θεὸν* states that his being an apostle of gentiles is in accordance with the truths enunciated in the preceding verses. *Ἐγὼ* emphatic, to denote his personal interest in the matter. *Ἐθνῶν* is also emphatic.

V. 14. *Ἐξ ὧν*: if possibly, if by any means, whether perhaps. That is his object and hope at the same time. *Μοῦ* in an emphatic position: they are his own people, and hence his desire. "Some of them": not the people as a whole. *Αὐτῶν* refers to *τὴν σάρκα* which is a collective singular: my flesh = my relatives as to the flesh or natural descent.

V. 15. As to the verbal forms to be supplied after the first clause ending with *κόσμου* and the second ending with *νεκρῶν*, the remarks made on verse 12 hold good also here, the sense of the two verses moreover being in general the same. "For" introduces the reason for Paul's desire and endeavor as intimated in



be inferred from the relation of the Jews to the patriarchs of old: if these were called to be the ancestors of a people belonging to God in a special sense, that people can not be rejected and hardened by God in such a way that the conversion of its members is absolutely impossible. On the contrary, the theocratic relation of these ancestors to God determines at least to this extent also the relation of their descendants, just as the offering of the first sheaf rendered holy and acceptable to God the use of the whole harvest (Lev. 23, 10 sqq.; comp. Num. 15, 18 sqq.), and just as the root influences the condition of the branches (16).

C. *The Jews can still be Converted and Saved:* Verses 17-24.

The fact that some, in reality the great majority, of the original members of the people of God because of their obstinate rejection of the Messiah have been cast away by

verses 13 sq. "Reconciliation of the world": here not the objective or universal one brought about by the death of Christ for the whole world, i. e., for all men without any exception, whether they accept it or not; but the subjective or personal one following the acceptance of the former by faith. The "world" means here the heathen world in so far as it accepted the Gospel. "Life out of (the) dead": many understand this of the life that begins with the resurrection of the dead, life eternal, maintaining that Paul as well as the original apostles expected the perfect establishment of the heavenly kingdom immediately after the conversion of the Jewish nation (Weiss); but that is the very point first to be proved, and not proved so far.

V. 16. *Eἰ* c. ind., comp. verse 12. "The first fruit": according to some the first sheaf with and through which the whole grain harvest was consecrated to the Lord so that it could be used for food agreeably to the Lord's will (Lev. 23, 10 sq.); according to others, the first part of the dough, or the first bread, made of the new harvest (Numb. 15, 19-21). We agree, however, with those that remark that if the latter were meant the next clause would read: καὶ τὸ ὅλον φύραμα; also the *whole* mass, or dough, as then a part would be opposed to the whole. In the first three clauses of this verse, the verb ἐστίν is to be supplied; in the fourth, εἰσίν. After φύραμα supply ἁγίων; after κλάδοι, ἅγιοι. "The first fruit" and "the root" mean the ancestors of the Jewish people; "the mass" and "the branches", their descendants, i. e., the people itself. The former were "holy" because chosen and called by God for the purposes of His kingdom; the latter, because of their natural connection with them. The holiness meant is the

God as no more belonging to that people in its true, spiritual sense, and heathen, who by natural descent were not members, have been given a place among the members and thus have become partakers of the rich blessings promised to the patriarchs and their true descendants (17)—this undeniable fact does not warrant any one of the latter class to think himself superior to the natural members; he ought rather to consider that he owes what he possesses and enjoys simply to his relation to the patriarchs and the promises given them in the first place, and in this regard is in no way superior to the natural members (18). To be sure, the casting away of the original members has served to have

theocratic one of belonging to God's people at least externally (comp. 1 Cor. 7, 14), together with the privileges dependent thereon, especially, having access to the means of grace.

V. 17. *Εἰ* c. ind., comp. verse 12. "The branches" the same as in the preceding verse. "Thou" addresses every heathen Christian individually. *Ἀγριέλαιος* can be noun (wild olive) or adjective (belonging to a wild olive); the latter meaning is preferable here as an individual heathen can not well be compared with a whole tree, but rather with a branch (comp. verse 24). "Didst become joint partaker of the root of the fatness" = of the fat, rich, blessed root (*τῆς πύοτητος* genitive of quality). This took place by conversion to Christianity, which meant insertion and adoption into the true Israel, the people of God, and participation in all the rich blessings promised to the patriarchs.

V. 18. "Do not boast against the branches": the Jews in general, as being inferior to thee. *Εἰ* c. ind., comp. verse 12; here, however, it is not known whether the condition is fulfilled. Thus the sense is: Supposing that you do boast against (them). *Κατακαυχᾶσαι* irregular form for *κατακαυχᾷ* (comp. 2, 17). Before the apodosis: "not thou bearest, etc.," the idea "consider", or "remember", must be inserted.

V. 19. *Ὅθεν*: therefore, then; seeing that there is no ground for boasting in thy relation to the root. *Κλάδοι* without the article: some of the branches. *Ἐγὼ* emphatic—a manifestation of self-complacency.

V. 20. *Καλῶς*: well (said), right. The assertion made is granted to be a fact; but the supposed speaker is reminded of the cause of this being so, which cause is adapted to warn against pride and selfconfidence. "By their unbelief" (the article standing for the unaccentuated possessive pronoun) is emphatic; in the same way "by thy faith" next to "thou" has the emphasis. "Be not highminded": do not entertain lofty, proud, haughty thoughts.

the gentiles receive the Gospel the sooner (19; comp. 11); but these latter ought not to forget that the only reason for the casting away of the Jews was their obstinate unbelief and rejection of Christ, and that the only reason for the reception of the gentiles is their acceptance of Christ by divinely-wrought faith. Hence there is not the shadow of a reason for the latter to be proud; on the contrary, they ought to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling (20; comp. Phil. 2, 12). For they cannot expect that God will treat them otherwise than the original members of His people (21). Consequently we ought to learn from this that God is both kindly merciful and severely just: the latter when He has to do with wilful sinners who persistently reject His grace, as the Jews did; the former when He finds faith in Christ and simple trust in divine grace and mercy; but whenever this faith is lost, nothing else is to be expected but the fate of the unbelieving Jews (22). On the other hand, if the Jews do not wilfully persist in their unbelief, but suffer themselves to be led to Christ by the preaching of the Gospel, they will again be received as members of the people of God; for nothing else hinders God from receiving also them but their obstinate unbelief (23). Being original members of the people of God, their

V. 21. *Κατὰ φύσιν* between article and noun used as an attribute = natural: the branches that are such by nature. *Εἰ . . . οὐκ* (not, as is the rule in hypothetical sentences, *μή*) because the negative is to be construed with only the verb: if God not spared = broke out, cast away. *Οὐδέ*: also not, neither.

V. 22. "Behold therefore": a conclusion drawn from vv. 20 sq. "Goodness (kindness) and severity" without the article, since these divine attributes are to be considered not in themselves but as they manifest themselves in these two opposite cases. "Upon those that fell" (the Jews that refused to accept Jesus as their Messiah and hence fell from their position as members of the people of God) "severity", namely, *ἐστίν*: is, rests, or, is directed. The same supplement must be made in the next clause, after *θεοῦ*. "If thou remainest" (which is regarded as probable: *ἐάν* c. conj.) "with (in) the goodness" = steadfastly puttest thy sole trust in the kindness of God. *Ἐπεὶ*: since otherwise (comp. verse 6). "Also thou": as well as the unbelieving Jews. "Wilt be cut out": viz., from the olive tree (a stronger expression than to be broken out in vv. 17 sqq.).

V. 23. "And they also": the branches broken or cut out. *Ἐάν* c. conj. again puts the case as possible and even probable, but dependent on the conduct, hence not sure and certain. "God

restoration, in case they give up their obstinate resistance to divine grace that is intended and sufficient also to save them, is certainly even more probable and easy than was the reception of the gentiles who originally were not such members (24).

D. *By the Conversion of the True, Spiritual, Israel the Divine Promise is being Fulfilled, to the Praise of God:* Verses 25–36.

From the unrelenting, ever increasing hostility of the Jews towards Christ and His Church at the time of Paul it might seem to follow that this people would at least be altogether and absolutely hardened and rejected, without any hope even for its individual members; hence Paul by divine inspiration announces that such an assumption would be erroneous, accordant, indeed, with self-conceited human reason, but not with divine wisdom and mercy. For the hardening of Israel is to be and remain only a partial and never a total one, so that during the whole time of the New Testament some members will be converted. This gradual and individual conversion will always accompany the conversion of the heathen world; and when the latter is completed, when all the heathen that permit themselves to be saved have entered the Church, then the end will come (25). And in this way the whole Israel will be saved,

is able": if His good and gracious, though not irresistible, will is not thwarted by their wilful and obstinate resistance. Everything depends upon the fulfilment of the condition mentioned: "if they continue not in their unbelief", which condition can be fulfilled by the grace of God offered in and through the Gospel. "Again": into their original place.

V. 24. *Γάρ* introduces a popular proof for the assertion that "God is able to graft them in again." "Thou" emphatic, meaning a Christian from the gentiles, over against those mentioned in the second clause, viz., the original branches. *Κατὰ φύσιν* (comp. verse 21) made emphatic by being separated from its noun *ἀγριελαίου* by *ἐξέξωπης*: a wild olive tree that is such by nature. *Οἱ κατὰ φύσιν*, scil. *ὄντες*: these that are by nature, originally, namely, branches of the good olive tree.

V. 25. *Γάρ* cannot introduce something entirely new or unexpected, but it introduces a proof for the assertion made in verse 24, viz., the possibility of the conversion of the Jews. "I would not have you ignorant": this phrase is always used by Paul to announce something important (1, 13; 1 Cor. 10, 1; 12, 1; 2 Cor. 1, 8; 1 Thess. 4, 13). "Brethren": an affectionate appeal to the

that is, all the natural descendants of Abraham and Jacob that at the same time are their true, spiritual children. And this is in accordance with the prophecy of Isaiah (59, 20 sq.) that the Redeemer of the world shall not merely come out of Israel but also for Israel, delivering them from their sins and thus saving them (26), and that the covenant that God makes with them will consist in His taking away

interest and sympathy of his readers, who in the majority were gentile Christians. *Μυστήριον* in the language of the Bible is something that no man can know without divine revelation, especially God's counsel of salvation (16, 25; 1 Cor. 2, 7-10; Eph. 3, 3-5). *Παρ' ἑαυτοῖς*: with yourselves, in your own opinion and judgment. *Ἀπὸ μέρους* is rendered emphatic by being separated from the verb to which it belongs, *γέγυονεν*. The hardening (comp. vv. 7 sq.) is such only in part in so far as some members of the people are continually and gradually being converted and saved. We say, "only in part", the emphatic position of *ἀπὸ μέρους* warranting us in supplying the adverb *μόνον* which in Greek is often omitted where in English or German it would be inserted (comp. 3, 28; 11, 5, 7; 14, 2). *Ἀχρις οὗ* = *ἄχρι τούτου ὅτε*: until that (time) when; so long that state of affairs will continue and not cease, viz., "until the fulness (the full number) of the gentiles will have entered in" (have become members of the Christian Church).

V. 26. *ὁὕτως*: the original and usual signification of this adverb is: *thus in this way*. After temporal sentences, clauses or participles the cognate signification "under these circumstances" = "when circumstances are such", can be synonymous with "then"; but the context must show that this is the case (e. g. Acts 7, 8; 20, 11; 1 Cor. 11, 28; 14, 25; 1 Thess. 4, 17). Hence *ὁὕτως* can include the idea of consecution in time only when the context demands it. This surely is not the case here. "All Israel will be saved": we have no right to depart from the usual signification of any one of the three words except context or parallelism compel us to do so. In the explanation given above "all" and "will be saved" are taken in their strictest sense. "Israel", however, is taken as denoting the true, spiritual descendants of Jacob, whilst in the preceding verse it evidently means his natural descendants. That may seem to be arbitrary; but we follow in this the example of Paul himself who 9, 6 sq. uses the same word, "Israel", in a similar way, namely, first in the natural, then, immediately after, in the spiritual sense (comp. 2, 28 sq.).

Verses 25 and 26 of this chapter are by most modern commentators understood as teaching a *universal* conversion of the Jewish people before the last day, this being regarded as the "mystery" that the Apostle wants his readers not to be ignorant of.

their sins (27; comp. Isaiah 27, 9). Thus, then, when God considers the attitude of the Jews towards the Gospel, He cannot but regard and treat them as His enemies, which, however, has been to the benefit of the heathen (comp. 11); but when He looks at their relation to the

---

The sense obtained by the most temperate representatives of this view can be given in the following paraphrase: "The partial hardening that has befallen Israel will, when the conversion, or Christianization, of the heathen world is completed, give way to a conversion, or Christianization, of the whole people as such." We do not mean to deny that there are verses in this chapter that seem to favor this view, e. g. 12, 15 sq. 28-31. And there have been, even in the most orthodox times of the Lutheran Church, Lutheran theologians of the highest standing that, though of course without any Chiliastic notions, either directly or indirectly advocated this view, e. g., *Aeg. Hunnius*, *Mylius*, *Balduin*, *Mentzer*, or at least left the question open, e. g., *J. Gerhard*, *Meisner*, *Weller*, *Dannhauer*. *Luther* at first, in the first edition of his Church Postil (1522), just as decidedly and strenuously advocated this view as he afterwards (e. g., 1538 and 1543) rejected it. One of the most conservative Lutheran theologians of our own century, *F. A. Philippi* went through the same changes as *Luther*, as did also the renowned Suabian reformer *Brenz*. Our main reasons for following the later *Luther*, *Brenz*, and *Philippi*, together with the great host of our older Lutheran theologians, are, in the first place, that we think *Paul* would have argued differently at several places (e. g. 9, 6 sqq.; 11, 1 sqq.) if he had believed in a universal conversion of the Jews, his actual argumentation seeming rather weak in that case, leaving out the most convincing point; in the second place, that according to the now common interpretation, if the wildest enthusiasm is to be avoided, in verse 26 the main words, "all" and "shall be saved", cannot be taken in their strict usual sense, but must be twisted and turned so as to mean what they mean nowhere else and cannot mean in this connection where "all", in this modern view, must be opposed to "part", and hence must be taken in its strictest sense, and salvation means nothing else than entering eternal life.

V. 27. "And this", namely, what follows in the last clause of this verse: "when I shall have taken away their sins." When this has taken place, then will this very fact, God's having taken away their sins, be for them the covenant that proceeds from God, that He makes with them; therein the covenant will be realized.

V. 28. *Kατά*: so far as (the Gospel, the election) is concerned. *Διὰ*: for (your, the fathers') sake. "Enemies" must here be taken in the passive sense because opposed to "beloved".

pratriarchs, whom together with 'their descendants He chose to be His people, He cannot but still love them (29). For as far as God Himself is concerned He never regrets or takes back His gracious gifts and especially His calling, but does so only in so far as He is compelled to do so by the persistent disobedience of man (29). Hence, just as the Christians from the heathen formerly proved themselves disobedient to the true God, but nevertheless now have received mercy in and by the preaching of the Gospel that came to them and was accepted when the Jews in their persistent disobedience and unbelief rejected it (30), so also now these have proved themselves disobedient; but the gracious purpose of God is that, having put themselves on a level with the disobedient gentiles, they shall receive the same mercy that these have obtained (31; comp. 15, 9). For God has given over to disobedience and unbelief both the gentiles (1, 24 sq.) and the Jews (11, 7. 25) as a just punishment of their obstinate resistance to His grace; but His gracious intention in all this is to show mercy to them all. Hence, on the one hand, no man can obtain salvation by any

V. 29. "Unregretted" and hence not recalled; emphatic position. Since "the calling" is one of "the gracious gifts" the *καί* that connects the two expressions must be translated "and especially", introducing that gift which in this connection is to be emphasized. "The calling" is the natural result, the actualization, of "the election" mentioned in the preceding verse.

V. 30. *Γάρ* introduces the application of the general statement in the preceding verse to the case in hand. "You": emphatic, in contrast with "these" in the next verse. "Once were disobedient": when in your heathen condition (comp. 1, 18 sqq.). "To the (true) God": the article before *θεός*. "But now": in and through your conversion. "Through the disobedience of these": the wilful unbelief of the Jews.

V. 31. *Ἠπειθήσαν*: have become disobedient (aor. ingress.) by refusing to believe, though it was made possible for them by the Gospel preached to them and the Holy Ghost working in and through it. "Through your mercy" = the mercy shown you (the possessive pronoun, *ὁμετέρῳ*, standing for the objective genitive): these words, as the parallelism with the preceding verse shows, belong to the clause introduced by *ἵνα*, but precede this conjunction for the sake of emphasis. The very same grace bestowed upon the heathen is intended and sufficient also for the Jews. *Καὶ αὐτοί*: also they, they likewise, just as the heathen with whom they have placed themselves on a level by rejecting the Messiah and His benefits promised them in the first place.

work or merit of his own; and on the other hand, no man is debarred from conversion and salvation by any partial decree or arrangement of God (32).

The contemplation of this glorious revelation of God our Savior so moves the heart of the Apostle that he gives expression to his feelings in one of the sublimest passages of his epistles. He adores and praises the unfathomable abundance of the riches of God in grace and mercy; of His wisdom in making everything serve His purposes; and of His knowledge of men and times, circumstances and means. What He judges and in general decrees to do cannot be searched out or examined into, and His measures and actions cannot be traced and found out by finite man; we can only know of it what He deigns to reveal to us (33); for no one has ever been able to look into His mind except through special revelation, and no one has ever been admitted to his counsels and deliberations (34). This proves the unfathomable abundance of His wisdom and knowledge; that of His riches is seen from this that there is none that can say that

---

V. 32. *Γάρ*: introduces the proof for the statement that God's mercy extends to all men. *Τοὺς πάντας*: all those of whom mention has been made in the preceding verses, heathen and Jews (the article before *πάντας*), which does not necessarily mean every single individual (*πάντας* without the article), as if no Jew had come to faith in Jesus without having first been given over to wilful unbelief. "Has shut them up into disobedience": they put themselves into that position, and then God punished them by shutting them up in it, giving them over to their self-chosen condition, hardened them in it. "In order that He might have mercy upon them all" (again *τοὺς πάντας*): that His mercy does not attain its object with all individual members (*πάντας*) is no proof against its existence and intention.

V. 33. "Riches and wisdom and knowledge of God" are coordinate genitives, all three dependent on "depth". Grammatically "wisdom and knowledge" could be dependent on "riches"; but verse 35 shows that "riches" is distinguished from "wisdom and knowledge" and meant to stand by itself. The "riches" of God (comp. 10, 12) are the basis for the manifestation of His "wisdom and knowledge", and the theoretical "knowledge" furnishes the opportunity for the exercise of practical "wisdom". None of the three could be wanting in God our Savior, and all three are infinite and boundless, and hence unfathomable as He Himself is and must be in order to be the true God.

V. 34. A citation from Isa. 40, 13 after the free translation of the Septuagint. *Ἐγένετο*: has become. Comp. 1 Cor. 2, 16.



God received anything from him for which He ought to reward him (35); for everything that exists has God for its final source and fountain, owes its first and continued existence to Him, and has to serve Him and His purposes. To Him therefore should be given the honor due to Him, for ever and ever, as certainly will be done by at least a part of His creatures.

V. 35. Comp. Job 41, 3. "And it will be given back to him in return" (ἀντ-απο-δοθῆσεται): a coordinate sentence instead of a dependent (consecutive) clause: so that it shall, etc.

V. 36. ὅτι: introduces the proof that the question in the preceding verse must be answered by: No one. From olden times on an allusion to the Holy Trinity has been found in our verse, "of Him" being understood of the Father, "through Him" of the Son, and "unto Him" of the Holy Ghost. When we compare other passages having similar expressions (e. g. 1 Cor. 8, 6; Col. 1, 16; Heb. 2, 10) we see that the prepositions found in our verse are by no means used in such a uniform way as always and exclusively to refer to the same person. For example, the third, εἰς, is used of the Father (1 Cor. 8, 6) and of the Son (Col. 1, 16). But, on the other hand, it is true that the first two as a rule apply to the same person, ἐξ to the Father and διὰ to the Son. This at least to some extent warrants the assumption that the same may also be the case in our verse, and that consequently εἰς may refer to the Holy Ghost. Beyond this sound and sober exegesis can hardly go. Thus the Father would be represented as the fundamental and causal principle of everything that exists, the Son as the mediator of all existence, the Holy Ghost as the principle and element of life that is to become more and more immanent. Ἀὐτῷ ἢ δόξα, scil. εἴη (the optative of wish; comp. 16, 27; Gal. 1, 5; Eph. 3, 21).

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ALTAR.

BY REV. W. E. SCHRAMM, ALLEGHENY, PA.

Of all visible accessories to worship, either of God's ordering or of man's devising, the altar is the most ancient. The very first divine service of which we have any record was an altar service. True, it is not stated explicitly that Cain and Abel erected altars, but the fact that they brought offerings unto the Lord implies some form of altar. Whether these sons of Adam were instructed of God as

to how they were to worship is a question. It seems very probable that they were; certain it is that "the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering." The altar which Noah builded unto the Lord and upon which he offered burnt offerings, likewise met with divine favor. In the time of the Patriarchs, a number of altars were erected; some at God's express command, others were voluntary expressions of a desire to worship, on the part of godly souls. These altars of early times were often built in places where the Lord had appeared, or in spots hallowed by other religious associations. The usual purpose for which they were erected was naturally that of offering sacrifice; although in some instances, they served simply as memorials. These rudely constructed altars of the patriarchal age gave way to the portable altar in the court of the Tabernacle; and this in turn was superseded by the larger and more beautiful altar of the Temple. To trace in detail the development of the altar of burnt offerings, to study its construction and to notice its relation to the altar of incense would doubtless prove interesting in this connection, but all this would be manifestly foreign to our purpose here.

To God's people of the old dispensation the altar was wholly sacrificial in its significance. The most devout and thoughtful of the patriarchs and prophets seem to have had no knowledge of the symbolical meaning of the sacrifices which they offered. There is no record, either in Holy Writ or in the ancient profane writings, to indicate that these men had even an inkling of the truth that their sacrifices were but a type of the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. They expected a redemption through a Redeemer, but they did not understand that this meant the remission of sins through a crucified Savior. They understood the divinely given laws concerning sacrifices without grasping the truth that those sacrifices were efficacious before God only in so far as the merits of the Messiah gave them efficacy. Their altars were to them a constant reminder of man's duty to bring his gifts to God; but concerning God's gift to man their altars were silent. While the light of fuller revelation makes manifest in the Old Testament altar a sacramental character, to the believers under the Law the altar was entirely sacrificial in its significance.

In the coming of Jesus Christ, Who, as our great High Priest, offered Himself as a spotless sacrifice to God for the propitiation of our sins, we have the substance of

that which is foreshadowed by the types and ceremonies of the Old Testament. In Him all types found their anti-type and all ceremonies found their fulfillment. These glorious shadow pictures by which the Jews were taught spiritual truths were therefore done away when the superior glory of that which was portrayed in the pictures was made manifest. From this it becomes obvious that the Jewish altar has no place or part under the present dispensation. Calvary's cross, upon which our blessed Savior suffered and died is the only altar of sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament. Sin without a sacrifice now, as in times past, clamors for vengeance, but the Sacrifice of the cross is amply sufficient to silence the clamoring of all the world's transgressions.

However it does not follow from this that that which we designate as an "altar", in our churches at the present time, is a misnomer. On the other hand, the term "altar" as applied to the Christian communion table has an appropriateness which is readily apparent to the thoughtful Christian: This use of the word is of ecclesiastical rather than of scriptural origin. The New Testament speaks of "the Table of the Lord," but does not refer to it as an "altar," unless Hebrews 13, 10 is such a reference, a matter which cannot be proven. Certain it is that the word was used in this sense very early in the history of the Christian Church. We find it so used already in the writings of Ignatius, who was the contemporary of some of the Apostles. Therefore the expression "Christian Altar" has been sanctioned—yes, hallowed—by not less than eighteen centuries of use.

The celebration of the Holy Eucharist demanded some form of table, upon which the elements might be placed during their consecration, and from which they might be distributed. As long as the little bands of believers met for worship in private houses, the ordinary table of the home was utilized for this purpose. But the external development of the Church required changes in the arrangements for the assembling of the believers; and, just as naturally, the internal development brought about changes in the ceremonies and customs of the service. The spiritual life of the believers gave birth to very beautiful and edifying forms, already in the early years of Christianity. It was during these years of the Church's pristine purity that the Table of the Lord began to develop in form and to grow in meaning. The result of this development and growth is the Christian Altar as found in the true visible Church of Christ

at the present time. It must therefore, be conceded that the altar as such is a human arrangement; yet we do not concede that it is a human invention. It is a legitimate growth of the same nature as are the Church Year and the Liturgy.

The prime purpose of the altar is, and always has been, for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Without this Sacrament, the altar would in all probability, never have been introduced into any branch of the Christian Church. The dispensation of the blessed Body and Blood of our Lord from it, is what gives the altar its right to exist. Not that the altar adds to the essence or validity of this feast of grace. The Sacrament is in every way complete and perfect, as instituted by the Lord Jesus. When in times of persecution, Christians celebrated the Lord's Supper on the trunks of trees, on the stones of graves and on elevations in the fields, the absence of an altar detracted absolutely nothing from the efficacy of the Sacrament. Notwithstanding this, he, who under normal conditions, would not prefer to receive the Lord's Supper from an altar, rather than from the trunk of a tree or the stone of a grave, either does not grasp the idea of this Sacrament, or else is sadly lacking in his sense of churchly order and propriety. The Christian who has a correct conception of the Eucharist and any appreciation whatever of that which is churchly, would show a decided preference for an altar. To us Lutherans the Lord's Supper is so intimately associated with an altar that we commonly designate it as "the Sacrament of the Altar." To us the altar has a meaning. To us it stands for one of God's precious means of grace. As the pulpit stands for the Word and the font for Baptism, so the altar stands for the Holy Supper of our Lord. Even at a minor service the altar is eloquent with meaning. It speaks. It proclaims a rich feast of grace. It tells of gracious pardon for the sinful; it tells of nourishment and strength for the weak and faltering; it tells of sweetest heavenly comfort for the afflicted and distressed. It tells, in short, of blessed communion in which sinful men may be drawn nearer to Heaven than is possible for them to approach in any other way on earth. These are the fundamental truths for which our altar stands. It is, therefore, primarily sacramental in its significance.

But our altar's significance is not restricted to the sacramental. The Holy Supper is so suggestive of the atoning work of our Savior that we can hardly think of this Sacrament without being reminded of Christ's agony

and death. It is this atoning work that we plead in all our supplications and prayers at the throne of grace. When we petition our Heavenly Father for mercy, our reliance is solely upon the blood and righteousness of Jesus our Redeemer. The altars in our churches are, in a certain sense at least, symbolical of Golgotha's altar upon which our Sacrifice expiated our sins. Therefore while the altar speaks of one of the means through which God comes to us with His grace, it also proclaims the ground of our acceptableness when we approach our God. This gives the altar also a certain sacrificial meaning.

There is yet another idea which augments this sacrificial significance of our altar, though not in a co-ordinate manner. In the ancient church it was customary at the services, for each communicant to offer some gift upon the altar. Of these offerings, such as were necessary for the celebration of the Holy Supper were set apart for that purpose; the remainder were used for the support of the ministry and for the benefit of the poor. Practically this same custom still obtains in our churches. The justification of this custom lies on the very surface of the matter. The offering is an integral part of a divine service. It is a blessed privilege as well as an imperative duty devolving upon every Christian to bring regularly a gift unto the Lord. When a congregation of Christians meets for worship, these gifts of the people are collected. What disposition shall now be made of them? The Christian Church has always regarded the altar as the most appropriate place upon which to lay these offerings. Nor does this in any way militate against the primary purpose of the altar. Our altar stands, and ever must stand, primarily for God's gift of grace to us, bestowed in the Holy Eucharist. Now upon this same altar from which we receive this rich and gracious feast, we lay our humble offerings, in token of our appreciation of God's manifold mercies, and of our gratitude to their beneficent Giver.

But perhaps we may be able to discern more clearly the scripturalness and beauty of our altar's significance by contrasting it with the altars, real and so-called, of other Christian denominations. Let us make comparisons, first with the altar as found in the Church of Rome, and then with the altars of the various Reformed bodies, and briefly note the points of contrast.

The altar of the Romish Church differs very materially from the Lutheran altar, just as the Romish conception of the Eucharist differs essentially from our own doctrine.

According to papistical teaching, there is in the Romish Mass a sacrifice; not simply a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, but a true propitiatory sacrifice whereby God is pacified. The celebrant in this ordinance is said to offer an unbloody sacrifice to God, by which atonement is made for the mortal and venial sins both of the living and of the dead. By this unscriptural view of the Eucharist, the Table of the Lord becomes, in the Church of Rome, an altar of sacrifice. This makes obvious a very important point of difference between the Lutheran and the Romish altars. While to the Lutheran the altar speaks primarily of divine grace bestowed upon men, to the Romanist it speaks of a sacrifice which men endeavor to bring unto God.

Again, the Romish Church makes a consecrated altar absolutely essential to the celebration of the Eucharist. According to this view, the use of an altar in the Lord's Supper is not merely a matter of churchly order and propriety, but the altar is a part of the essence of the Sacrament. To the Lutheran, the Sacrament makes the altar; to the Romanist, the altar makes the Sacrament.

There is yet another point of difference. The Church of Rome has for many centuries made use of her altar in her idolatrous martyr worship. Every altar used for the celebration of Mass must, according to Roman Catholic rule, contain some authorized relics. These are preserved in a cavity prepared for their reception, called "the tomb." At the consecration of an altar, the bishop of the diocese inserts the relics and seals up "the tomb" with the Episcopal seal. These relics are regarded with a veneration which amounts to worship. A Romish altar is, therefore, also a shrine, considered as sanctified by the presence of some martyr's bone or other relic. The Lutheran Church has always regarded the veneration of relics, and all kindred practices, with horror. There is not even a semblance of saint adoration or martyr worship in the significance of the Lutheran altar.

To make a comparison with the altar as found in the various Reformed churches is by no means an easy task. We might dismiss the whole matter by saying that these churches have no altars; for, while it is true that in nearly all Christian churches there is a table of some sort, it is very doubtful if that article of furniture should be dignified by the name of "altar." Some of the sects apply this word to their communion tables; others repudiate it. Even the

Anglican or Episcopal Church has, since the year 1552, designedly eliminated the word "altar" from her Prayer Book.

Concerning the Episcopalians we can hardly do more than say that there is among them a very wide diversity of views on this subject. On the one hand, there are clergymen of this Church who have ascribed a significance to their altar which can barely be distinguished from that of the Romish altar; some, on the other hand, declare that their Church has no altar, contending that it is misleading to designate the table of the Lord by this term. These are two extreme views. The majority of those who have written on the subject take positions somewhere between these extremes. This great lack of unity in the teaching of the Episcopal Church renders her altar practically nondescript. Therefore no satisfactory comparison with our own altars can be made.

As regards the altars of the other Reformed bodies, if we ascribe any significance at all to them, it is, strange to say, more like that of the Romish than of the Lutheran altar. It is sacrificial rather than sacramental. Among the various sects the Eucharist has, to a large extent, degenerated into a means whereby the participants proclaim their faith in the fact that Christ died for them. It is more a token of faith and of brotherly love than a true means of grace. Such a conception of the Eucharist naturally deprives an altar of any real sacramental significance, and leaves it but a meager sacrificial aspect. To the average sectarian congregation, the altar is simply a table placed in the church for the convenience of the pastor, deacons and committee on decorations, having no significance whatever.

The difference, therefore, between the Lutheran altar and the altars of other Christian bodies is not merely one of degree but of kind. The difference is identical with that between truth and error. Would that all Lutherans had a better understanding of these matters! Then would all appreciate and love this beautiful heritage of former ages, the altar of our Church.

**THE LAFAYETTE OF THE REFORMATION.**

BY PROF. A. PFLUEGER, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

It is a well known fact that the best and most delicious fruits rarely afford, in themselves, a true suggestion of the nature and appearance of the tree or the plant on which they grew. In like manner a tree or plant does not in its earlier stages give much evidence of the nature of the fruit it is destined to produce. Who on looking at an apple tree for the first time in the month of December, could form a definite idea of the delicious apples that may ripen on its branches in the coming summer? Who would suppose on the mere evidence of a luscious berry that it was produced by a cruel bramble? It is only by the results of our own observation and reading that we are able to infer the nature of the tree from the look of the fruit. On the principle that what is out of sight is out of mind we are often unconcerned about the fate of the tree while our palates are being tickled by the flavor of its fruit.

Now if this is true of things that come under our own observation, how much more it must be true of the things that are the results of the labors and struggles of men long since dead and buried or burned. We are enjoying the fruits of the past, but our knowledge of the past itself is exceedingly meager and often very inaccurate. It is only by a laborious process that we can get a true impression of the lives and labors of men that lived in distant ages and yet have left us a priceless heritage. After centuries of research we know comparatively but little about the life of Homer, though Homer's poems are open to all. The biography of the greatest dramatist that ever lived is embraced in a few lines and men dispute to this day as to whether he really wrote the works that are usually ascribed to him; but no one whose opinion on such a matter is worth listening to disputes the value of Shakespeare's writings, which may be read and enjoyed by every schoolboy in the land.

Of course, not all men share the same fate. Some are honored just as their merits deserve; some are honored too little, others too much; and some who deserved well of posterity are scarcely honored at all. The first great critic of Shakespeare was Theobald, but many know no more about him than that Pope once enthroned him as the king of dunces. The Lafayette of the Revolution is known to



every American. We all revere his memory. Even the school children are expected to contribute towards the erection of a monument to his memory on the grounds of the Paris Exposition in 1900. I venture to say that the Lafayette of the Reformation is not known to one in ten thousand of those to whom the name of the Lafayette of the Revolution is as familiar as those of their next-door neighbors. The Lafayette of the Reformation was not a military general, but he was a great scholar and a great upholder of the faith once delivered to the saints and taught and confessed by Luther and his colaborers. Of the Marquis de Lafayette it has been said "that he came to crusade for freedom in freedom's holy land." The Lafayette of the Reformation left home and native land to cast in his lot with Luther and the Lutheran Church; and although he did not come for the purpose of crusading, he nevertheless did crusade for religious freedom in the land of his adoption with admirable fervor and matchless energy.

Matthias Flacius, of whom I have been speaking as the Lafayette of the Reformation, was born at Albona, in Istria, on the 3rd of March, 1520. As Istria lies in the district known to the ancients as Illyricum, he is generally called Illyricus. He was a Slavonian by birth. His father's name was Vlacich, which the son, according to the custom of that age, Latinized into Flacius. His mother was of noble birth. The rudiments of an education he received from his father. After the death of his father he was instructed by Franciscus Ascerius, a learned Milanese. He soon made so great progress in his studies that he was sent to Venice, under whose control Albona then was, in order that he might devote himself to the pursuit of the so-called humanities as embodied in the ancient languages of Greece and Rome. Here he laid the foundation of his thorough linguistic attainments which were to stand him in excellent stead in after years and to make his influence in the land of scholars great and permanent.

It was his intention to become a monk that he might prepare himself for the service of the Church and the office of the holy ministry. With this end in view he went to his learned relative, Baldus Lupetinus, through whose mediation he hoped to enter a cloister at Padua or Bologna. In return for such help he offered to give one half of his paternal inheritance. Lupetinus, however, was a secret follower of Luther, and on account of his confession he was afterwards imprisoned for twenty years until he was at last

drowned in the sea. He received young Flacius kindly and pointed out to him that the true doctrine of the gospel had been brought to light again in Germany by Luther, at the same time giving him several of Luther's writings.

Young Flacius soon made up his mind to go to Germany, and in a few weeks he crossed the Alps and arrived at Augsburg, where in 1530 the Reformers had laid down their noble confession before the Emperor and the estates of his realm. Flacius applied for further instructions to Lycosthenes, a follower of Zwingli and was directed to go to Basel, where he was received with open arms by Simon Grynäus and supplied with boarding and lodging. While at Basel he continued his classical studies, especially Greek and Hebrew. But his great longing was to go to Wittenberg where the great Reformers, Luther and Melanchthon, were still living and teaching. There he hoped to find rest and peace for his deeply disturbed soul; for he was tormented with doubts as to his own salvation and was at times almost driven to suicide by the anguish and despair that filled his heart.

After one year's stay at Basel he went to Tuebingen. It is probable that he did not go immediately to Wittenberg because he was afraid to meet Luther and Melanchthon at a time when his soul was suffering under so great a load of despondency. At Tuebingen Flacius was soon on intimate terms with the most distinguished men in the various faculties, who came to his assistance with their advice and gave him lucrative employment.

From Tuebingen he went to Wittenberg, where Melanchthon received him with his well known cordiality and secured lodgings and employment for him. With great zeal Flacius perfected his knowledge of Greek and Hebrew and attended the lectures of Luther and Melanchthon.

But still his soul could find no peace; the old anguish continued to torment him until the chaplain of the university induced him to make known his distress. The chaplain comforted him and took him to Bugenhagen, who in turn took him to Luther. Now Flacius had come to the right comforter who had passed through similar trials. Luther proved to him that he was not a castaway, but simply a sorely tried Christian; and from this time on Flacius was a new man, finding joy and peace in believing the great doctrine of justification by faith alone.

At the age of 24 Flacius received the title of Master

of Arts and became Professor of Hebrew in the philosophical faculty. In 1545 he entered the holy estate of matrimony and had the pleasure of Luther's presence to grace the wedding. These were the happiest days in the life of Flacius. He could attend to his studies in quiet and peace, and full use he made of his time and opportunities. Besides on the Old Testament, he also lectured on the epistles of Paul and the writings of Aristotle, which studies were of inestimable value to him in after life.

How highly Luther esteemed him is evident from the fact that he rested his hopes on Flacius as the man who would take up the defence of the truth when the great Reformer himself should have gone to his eternal rest. Luther distrusted Melanchthon on account of Melanchthon's well known timidity and inordinate love of peace. Nor were Luther's fears without foundation; for Melanchthon had begun to vacillate even while Luther was still living, as was shown by his leaning toward the authority of Rome on the one hand and toward that of Geneva on the other. When Luther was dead Melanchthon's support was gone, and he proved to be too feeble to carry the burden which had rested on the mighty shoulders of his illustrious friend. There was need of a man that would offer an inflexible resistance to the enemies of the Reformation both within and without; and Flacius was to be that man.

When Wittenberg was forced to capitulate after the disastrous battle of Muehlberg, April 24, 1547, Flacius went to Brunswick, where he met with a kind reception from Dr. Medler, and also delivered lectures which were well received. In the autumn of the same year he was recalled to Wittenberg, which had in the meantime begun its work again.

But now the days of conflict were to begin in all seriousness. The Emperor Charles V. was determined to bring about a reconciliation or union by force between the Protestants and the Romanists. To this end he had put forth the so-called Augsburg Interim, by which the Protestants were to be deprived of their liberty in religious matters and to be compelled to conform to the doctrine and practices of the papacy. In short, the whole work of the Reformation was threatened with destruction.

The Augsburg Interim found no braver and abler opponent than it met with in the person of Flacius. He made use of his great gifts and learning to arouse the Protestants to a true appreciation of the dangers that threat-

ened them, and it was largely through him that the Emperor's plans were thwarted. When the friends of Rome found that they would be defeated in their efforts to enforce the terms of the Augsburg Interim, they used all their powers of persuasion and threatening to get Melanchthon to yield his assent to the unionistic scheme. While it is true that he could not be induced to yield to the Augsburg Interim, and even was among the first to write against it, he nevertheless helped to draw up the so-called Leipzig Interim, which was still more offensive to the faithful followers of Luther, for the very fact that Melanchthon had helped to produce it. It acknowledged the supremacy of the pope in the government of the Church and made great concessions to the Romanists with reference to baptism, the mass, ordination, fasting, and the like.

Against the Leipzig Interim Flacius threw all the weight of his mighty energy and zeal. He pointed out the fact that it is a betrayal of the truth to yield to its enemies even in matters that would otherwise be indifferent. It had been the contention of Melanchthon and his friends that they were willing to yield with reference to the so-called adiaphora only and that no principle was being sacrificed by their proposed Interim. But Flacius showed very plainly that it is a matter of principle not to surrender the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free and not to suffer ourselves to be entangled again in the yoke of bondage. Of course, this brought on a rupture between Melanchthon and Flacius. The friends of Melanchthon regarded it as base ingratitude for Flacius thus to oppose his colleague and former teacher and benefactor. That the rupture is to be regretted, who will deny? But what was Flacius to do? Was he to look on in silence while the truth was being betrayed in the house of its friends? All he could do consistently with his duty and his convictions was to warn against the dangers that were threatening the very existence of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. That he was sincere in his warnings is evident from the tone of his writings; and that he was right in his conclusions is proved by the fact that they are virtually embodied in the confessions of our Church.

To show that Flacius was not actuated by personal animosity against his colleagues at Wittenberg I need but call attention to the stand which he took over against Osiander. Osiander was a very learned man and very eloquent; but neither his learning nor his eloquence could save

him from the consequences of his pride and haughtiness. "Pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall." Before Luther died Osiander was known to entertain notions which were inconsistent with the doctrine of justification by faith. After Luther's death Osiander said that now that the lion was gone he would soon have done with the foxes and hares. Hence it was no great surprise to those that knew him that he began to teach that it is not Christ's acquired righteousness that is at the foundation of our salvation, but his essential righteousness according to His divine nature only. The logical consequence of such a doctrine is, that Christ's death was not necessary and that we could be saved even if He had not shed His blood for us and all the world.

Now Flacius and Osiander had hitherto been on friendly terms and Flacius regretted it very much to be obliged to enter into a controversy with Osiander, but he did not on that account hesitate for a moment in doing his duty. He arose in all his might and refuted the arguments of Osiander at every point. So clear and so cogent and so thorough was the argumentation of Flacius that little remained to be said by other defenders of the truth. In this matter, too, the Formula of Concord of 1577 adopts the same position that Flacius so nobly advocated.

In 1552 George Major came forth with the declaration that good works are necessary to salvation. Major was a professor at Wittenberg whom Luther had warned against the danger of falling into false doctrine, but the faithful doctrine was not heeded. As was to be expected, Major's prominent position and the vigor with which he defended his notions caused no small stir in the Church. In the zeal of their opposition some went to the opposite extreme and maintained that good works are a hindrance to salvation. This was especially true of Amsdorf. As usual, we find Flacius in the thick of the contest, the faithful champion of the truth, pointing out with irresistible force of argument that Major's theory is wrong and subversive of the doctrine of justification by faith alone; and again we find the Formula of Concord and Flacius on the same platform.

Not only with reference to the Leipzig Interim did Flacius feel himself in conscience bound to oppose Melancthon, but also in the great controversy on the freedom of the will before conversion. Melancthon maintained that man co-operates with the Holy Spirit in the work of conversion. Hence the term Synergism was applied to his doc-

trine, and those who followed in his footsteps were called Synergists. Painful as it must have been to Flacius to stand in opposition to his former friend and benefactor, he still did not flinch from the call of duty, especially as the Synergists were exceedingly bold and persistent in the propagation of their errors. But for him they would doubtless have made much more headway. His opposition was no small factor in the final overthrow of Synergism and in the settling of the controversy with the triumph of the truth.

In the controversy on the doctrine of original sin Flacius made his fatal mistake. He was led into this controversy by one of his colleagues in the university of Jena, where Flacius was a professor from 1557 to 1561. Victorin Strigel was the colleague referred to. He was a man of eminent ability in the realm of philosophy and metaphysics. But his theory was far from being satisfactory to the sound teachers of Lutheranism. He claimed that original sin is merely an accident, by which he meant to deny that man's nature has been thoroughly corrupted in consequence of the fall. When we take into consideration the sense which Strigel attached to the word accident we are not surprised that Flacius was not satisfied with it, but regarded it as dangerously inadequate to express the true character of human depravity. When Flacius expressed his disapproval of Strigel's proposition Strigel retorted, that if original sin is not an accident then it must be a substance, thus relying upon a philosophical distinction. This was a cunningly devised snare, and unfortunately Flacius went into it and thus brought disaster upon himself and his followers. He was immediately charged with being himself a dangerous errorist, and many who had walked with him faithfully could walk with him no longer. His enemies called him a Manichæan and drew all kinds of absurd and grotesque inferences from his statements, ascribing doctrines to him which he had never dreamt of teaching. Flacius never recovered from the effects of his mistake. From being regarded as the champion of orthodoxy he was thenceforward branded and persecuted as a heretic. The vengeance of his enemies knew scarcely any bounds and continued to follow him even after the earth had closed over his remains. The fate of Flacius is one of the saddest in the history of the Christian Church.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to turn from this painful

episode in the career of Flacius and to direct our attention to his achievements in the realm of literature.

Like Luther, Flacius had been reared in the faith and in the superstition of the Church of Rome; and, like Luther, he had not come out of that Church without a great inward trial and unutterable anguish. But, like Luther, he had found joy and peace in the faith of the gospel and stood ever afterward with immovable firmness on the everlasting rock of salvation through Christ alone. As Christ had promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church, Flacius was convinced that even in the days of densest darkness and deepest superstition there were many who did not bow the knee to Baal. He felt, too, that it would be a great benefit to the Church if the testimonies of God's faithful witnesses were to be collected and published to the world. This feeling was intensified by the constant taunt of the papal party: "Where was the Lutheran Church before Luther?" implying that Luther's doctrines had never been taught before except by notorious heretics. It was in view of this taunt and the needs of the Church that Flacius resolved to collect and publish his *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*—catalogue of witnesses to the truth. As his work was the first of its kind we can well believe that it cost him a world of labor and trouble to produce it. That he should undertake such a work under the circumstances is enough to excite our surprise, but that he should accomplish it in so matchless a manner is enough to fill us with admiration and delight. In it he shows that Luther and his coadjutors are surrounded by a great cloud of witnesses who lived in all ages of the Church from the day of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles in Jerusalem to the nailing up of the 95 Theses in Wittenberg on the 31st of October, 1517. He thus pricked the bubble of Romish arrogance and strengthened and the weak knees of the timid children of the Reformation. He furnished the Church of his adoption with a priceless armory against her enemies from without and paved the way for such works as the immortal *Confessio Catholica* of John Gerhard. Had Flacius written nothing else the Church should not be willing to forget his name.

Flacius's labors on the Catalogue of Witnesses were an important factor in the production of another work with which his name is indissolubly connected. I refer to the *Magdeburg Centuries*. This was the first, and for a long time the only, church history written by Protestant scholars.

It embraces the history of the Christian Church during the first thirteen centuries of the Christian era. The headquarters of the enterprise was Magdeburg, and hence the name under which the work is generally known, although its real title is *Ecclesiastica Historia Novi Testamenti*. It was printed at Basel, and appeared in 13 folio volumes, from 1559 to 1574. It devotes a volume to each century, arranging the materials under 16 heads. The learning displayed in the work is almost incredible, especially when we consider the obstacles that had to be surmounted and the difficulties that had to be overcome in the gathering, condensing and arranging of the materials. Flacius was not only the man who began the stupendous work, but he was also the soul of it from beginning to end. It speaks volumes in his favor that he was able to impart his enthusiasm to his collaborators and to secure the necessary financial means to have such a work appear in print.

Of course, very few read the Magdeburg Centuries now. Other works have taken their place in the library of the ordinary scholar. Nevertheless it remains a fact that our modern church histories are largely dependent upon the labors of Flacius and his men. He cleared away the forest and prepared the field for all subsequent Church historians, so that whatever Protestant history of the Church may be regarded as the second, his must always be regarded as the first. Herodotus was no more the father of ancient history than Flacius is the father of modern Protestant Church history.

In still another department of Christian scholarship the name of Matthias Flacius Illyricus stands at the head—the department of Hermeneutics. It was in his *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae* that he laid down the principles which have since been regarded as fundamental to the correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. “He may almost be called the founder of the science of hermeneutics,” says the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Dr. Twisten, who is a better judge in such matters than the writer in the *British Encyclopedia*, does not hesitate to call Flacius the real founder of hermeneutics.

Flacius was probably right when he declared that in the first 50 years of the era of the Reformation the Scriptures were searched more thoroughly than during the entire period of the previous 1500 years. He was himself a constant student of the Bible and an uncompromising defender of the supreme authority of God’s Holy Word in all



matters of faith and practice. Not only did he lay down the rules according to which the exegete must do his work, he also applied them himself in his *Clavis* and *Glossa*. The latter is a commentary on the entire New Testament and a part of the Old. The work on the New Testament was published and is of great value even yet, in spite of all the progress that has since been made in the domain of exegetical science. In the Old Testament his work advanced no farther than to the book of Job, and, so far as I am aware. It has never been published. The *Glossa* proves that he had exegetical gifts of a very high order.

The literary productivity of Flacius is simply marvelous. Preger in his biography of Flacius gives a list of 273 published works that flowed from that tireless pen. It is a known fact that, great and astonishing as this list is, it does not embrace all the works of this wonderful man. It is no doubt true that he wrote more than ordinary scholars, under such circumstances, would have found time to read. His inexhaustible resources and his iron industry are the admiration of all who know the achievements of his life and are capable of passing an intelligent judgment upon them.

On the 11th of March, 1575, at the age of 55 years and 8 days this great and good man died. He had not grown old in years, though he had in labors and persecutions. It is characteristic of the age in which he lived that another great and good man, whose name I will not mention, was capable of thinking and saying that Flacius had gone to dine with the devils in hell. No wonder that Melanchthon prayed to be delivered from the rabies theologorum — the fury of theologians.

I have chosen to call Flacius the Lafayette of the Reformation, because he came to Germany from a foreign country, was a friend of Luther, the Washington of the Reformation, and defended the doctrine of Luther as against the weakness of Melanchthon, the Solomon of the Reformation. I might close by calling him the Ishmael of the Reformation, seeing that nearly every man's hand was against him at the end; but I shall not so call him, because his name is too dear to me and his services to the Church are too great that I should add as much as a feather to the burden of obloquy that has been heaped upon his memory.

Great were his natural gifts; greater still were his industry and acquirements; greatest of all was his unselfish devotion to the truth as he learned it from the Word of God.

He brought to the cause of the Reformation all the love of his faithful heart, all the powers of his marvelous intellect, all the energy of his inflexible will. He not only had a profound knowledge of Greek and Latin and Hebrew, he was also thoroughly conversant with Italian and German; for he belonged to a race that is proverbial for the number of its polyglots. Although he never preached in German, he nevertheless wrote learned works in that language. In 1571 he published, with a Latin and a German preface of his own, the *Evangeliorum Liber* of Otfrid von Weissenburg, the most distinguished monument of the grammar, poetry and theology of the ancient Germans. It is noteworthy that until the year 1725 Flacius's edition of this work was the only one in existence.

It has been the misfortune of Flacius to be misunderstood and defamed by the very men who were dependent upon his labors for the success of their own. Those who rejoice in the achievements of the Formula of Concord as the great promoter of peace and harmony in our Church should not be ignorant of the fact that the name of Flacius is inseparably as well as most honorably connected with the struggles that led up to the final victory. It is doubtless true that he was sometimes rude and bitter in his attacks upon his antagonists. But it ought not to be forgotten that his antagonists were no better and often worse than he in the fierceness and bitterness of their invectives. Moreover, no one can read his works with care without coming to the conclusion that he was actuated by the purest motives and wrote with the sincerest devotion to the truth, and not for the sake of fame or a personal triumph. His faults were largely those of his age. But our own age is not without faults in spite of all the claims that are put forth with respect to our progress. It is probably true that controversies are now usually carried on with more dignity than formerly; but is there also as much reverence for the Word of God as is manifest in most of the writers of the sixteenth century? If it were necessary to be free from faults before one age would be allowed to throw stones at another, no stones would be thrown.

Up to comparatively recent times it has been customary to regard Flacius as an inveterate fault-finder. We think that no fair minded man can read the works of Preger and Twisten without arriving at an entirely different conclusion. Preger's *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit* is worthy of being read by every lover of the Lutheran Church.

It is exhaustive of its theme so far as Flacius is concerned, and successfully vindicates his memory against the aspersions of former critics. We most heartily recommend it to all who desire to be fair to the men of the past and to obtain a correct and comprehensive knowledge of the history of the Reformation after the death of Luther.

## CRITICISM: TRUE AND FALSE.

TRANSLATED BY W. E. TRESSEL.

### I. TRUE CRITICISM AND ITS METHOD.

#### I. *Conception and Right of Criticism in General.*

Modern biblical criticism claims with great positiveness to be *the* criticism. With much show of partiality our century is called the "critical century." Both these claims are unjustly made. It would be more exact to call our age the sceptical age and modern criticism the negative, unbelieving criticism. Long before our days there were periods that could cope with our century in keenness and depth of criticism. Only, the standard, the method and the result of that criticism were different. This will at once be clear if we ask: What, properly speaking, is criticism? Nothing else than a "testing." One that accepts nothing, the truth and the worth of which he has not himself proved, is properly called a critic. Whether the result of his investigation be affirmative or not, positive or negative, may be of importance in deciding the value of his criticism: it is altogether indifferent so far as the *notion* of criticism is concerned. When Chr. v. Baur, of Tübingen, in the sphere of New Testament criticism, permitted four Pauline epistles and the Apocalypse to stand as genuine and authentic, and declared this to be the "result of criticism," he had no right to deny his colleague, Bruno Bauer, the title of critic when the latter declared these five New Testament books also to be *un*-genuine. Both men stated the results of *their* examination, *their* criticism. But when the scientific opponents of these two critics declared: The whole collection of New Testament books proceeds from the first century, not from the second, that these books are therefore credible and genuine, i. e. are from the pens of the authors therein named, those two critics were not justified in denying to these, their opponents,

the title of critics and in asserting that they were blind, uncritical representatives of unscientific traditionalism. For the works of such of their opponents as Dr. Thiersch or Dr. von Hofmann and Ebrard proved that these men had reached their positive result *altogether according to the method pursued in learned examination*, that this testing had no need to shun the light, and, as the further course of the controversy showed, overthrew the results of the negative opponents. Even if the victory had not actually resulted as it did, the believing or positive critics would have just as good a claim to the word "criticism" as have the unbelieving, negative critics. The same is true of the present when the activity of criticism is preponderantly directed to the province of the Old Testament, especially to the Pentateuch. It is deserving of censure when Wellhausen and retinue, who put forth in a new edition the results of a de Wette, Vatke and other rationalists of more than sixty years ago, are regarded as critical theologians, while on the other hand the great Old Testament theologians of our century, who, in penetration of intellect, in learning and in genius are fully the peers of the former, such men, for instance, as Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil and others, and some that are still living, like Dr. Green and those that have appeared in connection with "*Lex Mosaica*," to name a few only, are decried as uncritical credulous echoers of an untenable tradition and hardly deserving of more serious attention. This has come to be the custom in the camp of those who in truth can only lay claim to the name *unbelieving* or *negative* critics, but not to the unmodified title critics. Simple scientific righteousness, which one owes to his opponent under *all* circumstances, demands recognition of the fact that positive theologians offer their results in accord with the method of conscientious investigation; that is, according to the critical method, with an accurate exhibition of their scientific reasons, and that they do not ask a blind belief but only reinvestigation and eventually refutation. Nothing more.

Thus every one that does not accept a thesis in good faith, but first of all tries it with regard to its truthfulness by all the means at his disposal, practices *criticism*.

Our century, however, was not the first to learn to exercise such criticism upon the objects of spiritual, that is believing, life, as if former centuries had neglected critical inquiry. That could, perhaps, be said of the Romish Church, whose first proposition reads: "The church never errs. You must, in blind obedience, without any investigation,

submit yourself to her, so soon as she has spoken." On the other hand, so long as there has been an evangelical-protestant church has her theology been a critical theology as over against the views of her opponents. The solid foundation upon which she grounded herself in her opposition to Romanism was the Holy Scripture. By this standard, which the Romish church also recognized as a divine rule, she tried the faith, the doctrine, the life of her foe. But not less by the standard of church history. Great scientific works like the "*Examen concilii Tridentini*" of a Chemnitz, or the "*loci theologici*" by Gerhard, of the highest importance for all ages, were throughout also mighty critical productions of genius. Luther's and Calvin's writings were not merely thetical, but at the same time critical also. The whole Reformation was a powerful critical act. And if we look at the post-apostolic age, we find that the history of the dogmas and the collection of the canon were a Herculean work of criticism in which the greatest minds sifted, tried what was genuine and ungenuine, true and false.

Yea, Christianity itself did not appear without holding a reckoning with the four millenia of intellectual and religious development and introducing the greatest crisis of the ages. Nowhere, finally, did Christ and His disciples demand a submission devoid of examination and criticism. On the contrary they everywhere challenge individual investigation. I direct attention, by way of example, to the following passages only: Matt. 7, 20, "by their fruits ye shall know them"; Luke 12, 56, "but how is it, that ye do not discern this time?" Rom. 12, 2, "that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God"; Phil. 1, 10, "that ye may approve things that are excellent"; 1 Thess. 5, 21, "prove all things"; 1 John 4, 1, "try the spirits whether they are of God."

It is, consequently, altogether a mistake, when men act as if the spirit of criticism had just awaked in our century. Wherever conscious intellectual life and aspiration manifested themselves, most of all in the highest, the religious, questions, and wherever there was living faith, there too the spirit of criticism between true and false, good and bad, was on the alert. And it is just as foolish to hug the delusion that criticism exists only where the positive is denied, and that, on the other hand, where the positive is affirmed, there exists only uncritical belief in tradition. The matter is clear and needs so many words because the destructive criticism of our days ever claims anew, un-

justly, the title criticism for itself alone, and thus would at the very outset discredit in the popular mind all those that do not belong to, but rather combat, its host. For an uncritical man is in fact always a "good stupid fellow," deserving of sympathy but not of respect or attention. That criticism has its *right*, yea is a *duty*, which no thinking man dare disregard, is indeed easy to see.

Truth is not, in this world, encountered unadulterated, and is not plucked by us without effort like fruit from a tree. It rather resembles gold that we often find deep-hidden and as it were turned into ore, bedded in stone and dross. For the character of this world since the fall is a mixed one. Light struggles with darkness, is mingled with darkness, is hemmed in by darkness, as the light of the sun by rising mists. And in ourselves are light and darkness, the old and the new man. Both make themselves felt. Therefore keen, searching, critical eyes are needed in order to discriminate between what springs from the realm of truth and what from the abyss of the realm of darkness. Woe to him who accepts whatever recommends itself to him as truth, especially in the domain of religion. He is a lost man. Therefore criticism must be exercised everywhere, as in the sphere of the material, so also in the sphere of the intellectual, and above all in the sphere of the religious, life, where the consequences of delusion are eternal. You accept no gold-piece, no ornament from the jeweler, without testing it; still less accept an article of faith without trying it as regards its truth. Therefore the apostle says: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Only in the kingdom of the eternal unclouded light will there be no need for criticism. But on earth criticism has its right. Yea, it is a *duty* for him who seeks to obtain a well-established foundation of truth and who would not blindly with the blind leaders fall into the ditch.

## 2. Right of Biblical, specifically of Old Testament, Criticism.

But how? Shall not criticism remain silent as over against the Bible, at least? Must one not observe an uncritical submission toward Scripture? It might seem so when we consider the attitude of our fathers, the reformers. What was their final proposition by which all other propositions were tried? "*Thus saith the Scripture.*" Therewith everything was settled for them. And so the Scripture was the norm by which all else was measured. How can the

norm have still another norm? The Holy Scripture is God's infallible word. That was their firmly-fixed, final axiom. They no more doubted this than the mathematician doubts his axioms. When one does not doubt, one no longer has cause for criticism. Criticism is, truly, always the way that one goes when being led from doubt to certainty. When one is certain, he no longer investigates. Is then, indeed, a "halt" called to criticism as it stands at the portal of Holy Scripture? The Romish church halted before the authority of the church, the Reformation church exercised criticism upon the church, but made a halt before the Holy Scripture. Modern criticism passes even this limit and practices criticism upon *Scripture*. Those are the three stadia of criticism. Shall we join in taking this third step? Yes and no, as one regards the matter.

The Reformers said, No. We can with them say the same thing if we consider only the manner in which the Christian *as such*, as *believer*, not as man of science, attains certainty instead of doubt with respect to that which he as Christian believes. A few words on this point!

The simple Christian also is exposed to doubt. For the objects which a Christian believes are not sensual, palpable, but supersensual, transcending his natural human experience and the knowledge derived therefrom; yea, these objects seem to stand in contradiction to his natural human experience. Thus, for instance, the wonderful facts related in Scripture and the wonderful character to which the Scripture lays claim, namely as God's infallible word to men, although actually it comes to us as a human word. At every point here doubt can be awakened in the simplest Christian, and the consequence will be either the certainty of faith or the certainty of unbelief, yes or no. For no man can be satisfied with continual uncertain vacillation between two possibilities, or, in other words, with doubt. He requires rest with regard to a matter, certainty for his faith (*ὁπόστασις* \*). But on this account the simplest Christian will be forced upon the only road that leads from doubt and its disquietude to the repose of certainty concerning the object of faith in question. It is the way of certifying ourselves by investigation or *criticism*. This test, however, is for the simple uncultivated Christian not scientific, or according to logically arranged intellectual arguments; the *shortest way* of exploring the matter, *experience*, is

---

\*A support.—Tr.

sought out. This way is open to the simplest Christian, even to the child. It would be sad if only the learned could reach certainty respecting objects of faith, whilst nothing would remain to the laity except merely to receive blindly, without personal conviction, what the "knowing," an intellectual aristocracy, a priesthood of the learned, would find good to offer them as the results of their science or their tradition. No, even the plainest Christian, a poor woman, a child\* can come to that personal certainty regarding the Bible and the Bible's contents, its marrow and bright star, Christ, upon Whom salvation depends, or in other words: to certainty respecting the *source* and the *way* of salvation.

a) *The Christian's critical self-certification and its moral way.* This short way of certifying investigation is: "Come and see!" John 1, 3. 9. Then vs. 45, 46; ch. 4, 41-42. It is the moral way of the *impression* made by personality upon personality without the long intermediate stages of intellectual proofs which, at any rate, do not strike the center of man's being, the heart, but can satisfy a single function only of the mental life, the reasoning faculty. Every one is naturally endowed for this test and confirmation, proceeding as it does from the center of the moral man and retroacting upon the same, therefore overcoming the ego of the man at its very *root*. Man possesses a moral eye, a moral optic nerve, for all moral objects, as he has a natural eye for objects of sense. And the process of confirmation as regards the moral object is accomplished according to the similar law that obtains in the world of sense. The first thing is: The self-revelation of the object in its working upon the natural or moral sense. The object imprints itself, as it were, on the chemically prepared plate of the moral man. Then there follows the judgment of the moral man (of his conscience) as to whether this object corresponds with the moral laws of man's being. The third thing is the sense of *harmony* between the object and the subject. Therewith the feeling of certainty regarding the object is obtained. The subject, with the consciousness of personal conviction, trustingly yields itself to the object. The object has now become so blended with his own life that this conviction could only be dropped with his own being.

\* Cf. in illustration of this point Sir Walter Scott's "The Monastery", Vol. II, Chap. XII, where a paragraph is devoted to a description of Mary Avenel's experience with the sacred volume, and how, after reading the precious promises to the distressed, "her heart acquiesced in the conclusion, Surely this is the Word of God!"—Tr.



This short *moral* way of examination and certification was followed by the first Christians, by the Reformers, is followed to-day yet by every Christian. Upon this way only does the Christian arrive at *divinely* wrought certainty regarding the divine object, Christ, through the means of Scripture. This object penetrates, by the powers of the Holy Ghost, into the Christian's moral organ, and attests itself in the innermost parts of the soul as fact, as truth, so that he could die a thousand times for it, as he can die for the truth that one object is a tree, another a river and still another a mountain, which he has seen with the eye and touched with the hand.

By virtue of this empirical, not scientific, heart and conscience experience and conviction, the Holy Scripture was to our first Christians, to our Reformers, is today yet to every true Christian God's unerring Word. That which agrees with my stomach is not stone but food, that which is suited to my lungs is not smoke but air, that which is adapted to my eye is light. What satisfies fully my divine sense and impulse, my conscience, is divine and holy. But, of course, this certainty respecting the Scripture is first of all a *centralized* one. It is concerned with the *sum* of the contents of Scripture, with *Christ* and *His* work and Word. And there Christ's image in his holiness and love as exhibited by *words* and deeds and life majestically confronts *me*. My *moral* being says: Thou art the Holy One. That is the first step of this recognition. This Holy One, however declares Himself to be God's Son. Thus I am driven to the second step: Thou Holy One art God, for since Thou art holy I must believe Thy every word. The Holy Man leads me to the God-man. Thereby the Scripture, which brings Him to me, is vouched to me in its *central* part. He, however, confirms to me further, through His promise to His disciples as His future representatives, everything which they as teachers of the world shall say and write, i. e. the *whole* future New Testament in all particulars. And Christ and His authorized witnesses, i. e. the New Testament, attest to me further the whole Old Testament as it lies before them. Cf. e. g., Matt. 5, 17-19; then 2 Tim. 3, 15-17; Acts 24, 14. Thus, first of all, Christ avouches Himself to me in the New Testament, then through Him the latter itself is confirmed. Though the New Testament the Old Testament is attested.

Such is the criticism of believing experience and the certainty for *faith* therefrom resulting. Here our Refor-

mers took their stand. Scientific criticism was not a necessity in their time. Thus we do, as *Christians*, take our stand today and unto the last day.

As *Christians* we have divine certainty as to the Scripture and can *dispense* with the human scientific attestation. As Christians we, with our fathers, make a *halt* in our scientific criticism before the Scripture. It is to us an *untouchable, morally attested, authority*. But not so as men of science. As such we *can* not halt before the Scripture. Even it becomes an object of our examination. And for two reasons.

b) *The critical certification of the theologian and its intellectual way*. First, for an *external* reason. This is the appearance of the negative criticism. Then for an *internal* reason, the need of the intellect itself. At the end of the 18th century and especially at the beginning of our 19th Deism appeared in France and England, in the former country degenerating into materialism, and from this standpoint made the Holy Scripture, that solid foundation of the Christian faith, both as to its contents and its origin, the object of analyzing and destructive criticism. The Old Testament was included in the attack. Above all, Voltaire poured out his mockery, mingled with shallow arguments and insufficient knowledge, upon the Old Testament. In Germany there followed the vulgar rationalism, the Kantian critical rationalism, the more subtle æsthetic rationalism. And naturally the main attack was always directed against the credibility and the genuineness of the source of all Christian facts and doctrines, the Holy Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament. One left more, another less, a third almost nothing stand as credible and genuine. Thus the foundations of the Church's stronghold were undermined and above the ruins of the battle-field the manikin of a critical professor proudly rose as victor, considering himself competent to assist the Lord Christ and His apostles, as poorly informed men, to the right understanding of the Old Testament and even of themselves and to help the whole church for the first time in 1800 years to the understanding of the New Testament. The human subject had become an idol.

At the end of our century this science of the "old Adam," from which the experience of the new man in his complete conversion to Christ, who is the root of true science, totally differs, the old rationalism of criticism has

again awakened. This is particularly true in the domain of the Old Testament, as is evidenced by Wellhausenism and its more *moderate* imitators of the so-called mediating criticism which still wishes to be known as "believing."

How? Shall the church silently fall back upon her peculiar spiritual certainty, which she in trusting obedience to the clear testimonies of her heavenly divine Lord carries within herself and which only then vanishes from her when she ceases by the process of daily contrition and faith to become ever again conscious of and convinced respecting Him, Who, as He is her righteousness, sanctification and redemption, as well as her truth, is also made of God to be unto her wisdom? This same is He that speaks: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the *truth*," John 8, 31, 32, possessing this truth in His words. Yes, from this standpoint of believing obedience the church certainly abides immovably firm, in so far as she is in true living faith, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against her. But she has also members—and these are the majority—that do not yet occupy this firm position of certainty which proceeds from faith. These are deeply influenced by the prevailing worldly culture, for them the "science" that is in vogue counts as authority. They do not come to the full repose of faith until their intellect has clearly seen that all the arguments of science *against* the Holy Scripture and the faith of the church are not really scientifically tenable, but are only specious arguments. And these members of the church are indeed just the cultured ones, the aristocracy of the congregation intellectually. Shall the church simply refer such members to something like the following: Our Head and Lord says the opposite of what this science teaches; consequently this is a wrong, misleading, science, a *falsely* boasted knowledge (*ψευδῶνυμις γνῶσις*)?

No, that she dare not do without producing the impression that she does not know what to answer to the sceptical questions that in the name of science are put to faith, and as if the words of the Bible stood in clear contradiction to the results of human science. In that way she would alienate the cultured and prove herself incompetent to be instructress of the nations and of the cultured circles in these nations; she would become a "religio paganorum." Much rather has the church the duty, according to 1 Pet. 3, 15, over against such "false Gnosis," to stand forth with her "sound and genuine science," born of faith, and to ren-

der account of her belief and hope. And so the uprising of unbelieving science is one reason that calls forth the believing science of the church, that is, makes positive criticism necessary as over against negative criticism. The other reason is an *inner* one, the impulse of the intellect itself, an impulse that is ever present with the Christian also. Even if the negative criticism, with its stimulative power, did not impel to positive criticism, still the intellectual need of the mind would not let the Christian rest from penetrating with the bright light of the understanding that which he in faith possesses and from arriving at clearness for himself, through an investigation according to the rules of science of the various arguments on account of which the understanding also can allow that to stand which the heart possesses through faith in Christ's word. For the believing Christian is also a thinking Christian. And no man can long endure it when the thoughtful intellect arrives at a different result from that reached by the believing heart. That would be an unnatural state. If, in general, there is in this world certain truth attainable by man, then it must, in any case, be but *one*, not a double, self-contradictory truth. Now, if Christ in His word is the truth for the believing Christian, then a result contradictory to this reached by the thinking Christian cannot possibly be truth. There remains nothing except to sacrifice either Christ to science or science to Christ. Inasmuch as nothing stands firmer for the believing Christian than the proposition: Christ is God, and, accordingly, every word proceeding from Him is infallible truth, he must necessarily pronounce that science which contradicts Christ's word to be *erroneous*, and *such* criticism to be a *false* criticism. Consequently he must, on his own part, proceed to an examination, i. e. criticism, according to the genuine, universally sound principles of science, in order to prove that his faith is in *harmony* with the result of a truly *sound* criticism, so that the scientific intellect says "yea and amen" to the believing heart. And here I agree with the proposition of criticism that "science must be refuted by science, criticism by criticism." Therefore the self-certification of *faith* as regards the Old Testament, about which we are here concerned, specifically the Pentateuch and its credibility, must be presented, i. e. it must be proved from the New Testament how the question of the genuineness and the credibility of the Pentateuch must be decided by the statements and the position of Christ and the apostles, who were authorized by

Him to be teachers of all nations. And this proof is *wholly sufficient* for the *Christian* as simply a believer bound to Christ, so that he can say with perfect assurance: "The Pentateuch comes from Moses and is from beginning to end humanly and divinely credible." But then the man of science in the Christian steps forward and investigates the object in question, e. g. the Pentateuch, in accordance with the rules of sound historical criticism, as these are acknowledged to be valid for all, even profane, historical documents of the past, in order that he may in this human scientific way firmly establish whether the result of such examination stands in agreement with or in contradiction to the assurance of faith, which assurance he owes to the declarations of Christ his Lord concerning the contents and the author of the Pentateuch and the position taken by Christ and His apostles with reference to the Pentateuch. Should, however, his critical investigation lead to a different result from that which Christ's words would lead us to expect, then this one thing, by virtue of the divine self-assurance of his faith in Christ remains *a priori* beyond doubt, that the *error* is not to be sought in the infallible veracious Son of God, for He could neither hold error, nor, much less, utter it, nor knowingly and wilfully so accommodate Himself to an error of His environment as expressly, by a positive declaration to corroborate and sanction it as true, for all ages, among those that believe in Him as God's Son and their Lord. The Christian will rather recollect that human science is *actually* fragmentary, *has* shown itself countless times to be in error, also proceeds frequently on mere suppositions and *conjectures* and, as historical science, often makes us feel the absence of the necessary foundations for drawing a sure conclusion. Therefore he will not doubt, for a moment, in case of a contradiction between the declarations of Christ, to which simple Christian faith is bound, and human criticism, that the error lies on the side of *criticism alone*. The only result of this will be that he will commence *anew* with so much the *greater scrupulousness* his critical investigation and will then carefully separate the undoubtedly certain from the merely probable, the *ἐπιστήμη*, scientific knowledge, from the *δόξα*, opinion. He will ultimately discover that it is the mere *supposition*, the hypothesis, the conjecture, that preadventure clashes with faith. This opinion, however, will not oblige him to surrender his faith with the superscription, "unscientific." For the *opinion* of the most learned man does not become science because a great and

learned man opines it. But the real *facts* of science have never yet contradicted faith, as little as the *facts* of nature have done so.

Criticism, then, has its right, even in the examination of the Holy Scriptures, here specifically the Pentateuch.

*But not all criticism.* There is a *false* criticism that has the *appearance* only of science, yet closely examined is in the highest degree unscientific. In order to recognize this caricature of criticism and not to be deceived by it, it will be necessary for us to become acquainted with the picture of *genuine* criticism.

### 3. *The Point of Departure for Scientific Criticism.*

What course does genuine criticism pursue when examining any document of the past with respect to its credibility and genuineness? Profane criticism teaches us the answer. We must first of all be concerned about the right *point of departure* for critical procedure. This can be no other than *tradition* objectively, subjectively trustful confidence in the tradition, namely in the documents transmitted and their authors, as well as in the intervening persons through whom the documents either with or without the names of the authors, have descended from their authors to us. But the starting-point dare not be a purely subjective one, namely belief in a particular dogmatic proposition, and, indeed, neither in a negative nor in a positive sense.

Of course the opinion that any critic can approach his investigation as if he were an unwritten card, this talk of a freedom from religious presupposition, is mere fancy. No man is wholly free from presupposition. Each man is the product of an external and internal historical development. He would be nothing without the factors with which, from childhood on, his life has brought him into reciprocal relation. Each investigator brings to his critical task not a mere empty intellect, but *himself*, altogether such as he has become, and therefore he brings with him a specific view of the world and of life as this point of view has developed through the action of the external world and the reaction of his moral and intellectual ego. In short, he cannot "jump out of his skin" when he sits down at the writing-table. And the last, deepest differences in the individual world-view appear in the sphere of religion, for these differences concern the ultimate cause of all things which we Christians call God. Whether this ultimate cause be only a pantheistic or materialistic imagined "unconscious thing,"

or an absolute personal ego, we indisputably find here the point of widest difference between these world-views, and all further elements of these views receive their tendency from this difference. In other words, every man approaches his scientific task, the critical included, with a religious or an irreligious disposition of heart. Thereby the direction that is given to his mental eye, the point of view from which he regards everything, and the horizon which his mental vision scans are conditioned. So far as the believing Christian is concerned, the new man has been begotten in him through regeneration and conversion, and he possesses a new spiritual eye of which he cannot and should not rid himself. There exists for the naturalist the old man only, with his purely natural sphere of experience and his natural eye adapted accordingly. And, too, such a critic can never rid himself of his entire intellectual standpoint. He can acknowledge and believe no miracle, neither an internal nor an external, *even if he wanted to*. His standpoint is too low for that. He has not experienced *in himself* the fundamental miracle of regeneration, which lifts to the higher standpoint of the new man. He is to be pitied. No intellectual path leads from the position of the old to that of the new man, but only the moral road of contrite faith wrought by the Holy Ghost by means of God's Word. Thus neither the believing nor the unbelieving investigator is ever free from presupposition. The course and the goal of their critical labor are already determined for both by their internal tendency in accordance with which their thinking proceeds.

If the believing inquirer had to deal only with other believers, he might avail himself of his believing presupposition in the course of his critical investigation, for his position would be acknowledged by the others as established. But this is not the situation. He has for antagonists those that take their stand on another fundamental principle and do not acknowledge his supernatural fundamental position. Accordingly the believing critic, in order to discuss with the critic, at least in the domain of science, and to disarm him, must hunt a common ground for the critical discussion. This can be no other than the rules of profane criticism, in which the religious-dogmatic question remains altogether out of consideration. But the opponent also must agree to renounce for the time being his dogmatic fundamental presuppositions, and therefore, in case questions regarding miracles or prophecies arise, he may not say: Miracles and prophecies are impossible, consequently

the book that contains them is, for this very reason, un-genuine and incredible. For in doing that he intermixes the dogmatic, philosophical question with the purely historical. Likewise the positive theologian dare not, in the question touching the genuineness and the credibility of an Old Testament work, employ any argumentation drawn from the authoritative testimonies of Christ or the apostles, though these testimonies possess for him as *Christian* the highest proof, towering heaven-high above all scientific arguments. Much rather must the whole investigation proceed purely in accordance with profane-historical principles. One must simply inquire: Are the authors and their documents genuine and credible according to purely *historical* principles, as these principles hold good for the writings of a Demosthenes, a Thucydides, of a Virgil, a Tacitus? What did these authors want to say? Could they record the facts and did they want to deliver these conformably to the truth? Not however: Was that philosophically *possible*, which they were able and willing to record? For that would immediately involve a philosophical-dogmatic consideration. Ranke, in agreement with Hengstenberg who approves the former's method, very pointedly says, regarding this method of procedure, also adopted by him in his investigations relating to the Pentateuch,\* in the preface: "The right standpoint (for the critic of the Pentateuch) is that of a man earnestly seeking the truth, decided neither for nor against the truth, who tries to inform himself whether this book has the same attestation as have the occurrences of profane universal history." Upon this *neutral* religious standpoint, with the specific object of a scientific investigation in view, one can very well place himself, as over against his opponent, setting aside such proofs as pertain to the domain of dogmatics or philosophy.

And thus, in spite of the fact that there is in reality no freedom from presupposition, there must be chosen, for the sake of the opponent, only the *historical* point of departure, on which all profane-critical investigation must plant itself in order to get on. That is *historical tradition* and *faith* in the same. This indispensable foundation of every historic-critical investigation deserves at the present day a closer consideration.

---

\* Untersuchungen ueber den Pentateuch von Dr. Ranke, 2 vols., 1834 and 1840.



4. *The Method of Scientific Criticism.*

Historical criticism has for its object the monuments and documents of antiquity. Without these it has nothing to examine; and, also, no basis on which to plant itself. It would stand in the air. These objects of its investigation have come to it upon the way of *tradition*, the being handed over and down from others. Even the most radical criticism cannot take the first step without this foundation. It can, therefore, at the most, undertake expurgations of this documentary material. But never can it wholly loose itself from tradition and the authority of the same. In the sphere of the New Testament the radical criticism of the erstwhile Tübingen school convincingly shows this. In order to be able to work at all and to accomplish something, Baur had to let stand as genuine — of course in an entirely arbitrary way — five books of the New Testament, the Apocalypse as memorial of the Petrine tendency postulated by Baur, and the first four epistles of St. Paul as memorial of Pauline Christianity. The reasons that convinced him of the genuineness of these five books were not stronger by a hair than the reasons which believing theology advances in favor of the remaining homologoumena of the New Testament. Merely his theory, with which as a presupposition he approached the criticism of the New Testament, namely the presupposed contradiction according to the Hegelian scheme between Petrianism and Paulinism, was the motive for his ascribing genuineness to just these five books as seeming witnesses for his axiom and acknowledging the grounds for doing so to be valid, which validity as to the remaining books he combatted. He had to have this traditional groundwork in the five books named in order that from this *δός μοι πῶς στῶ\** he might remove out of the way the churchly conception of the other New Testament books and therewith the whole history of the foundation of Christianity as recorded in the New Testament and set up instead his own a priori constructed history thereof, without the Christ of the church. We shall see later on whether an entirely similar method is not followed in the present Old Testament criticism.

All our historical knowledge rests in the last instance on the eye- and ear-witness of others.

The eye- and ear-witness of those that in the past have witnessed any event is communicated by the witnesses to

---

\* Grant me ground to stand on.

their contemporaries who have not observed the fact in question. Thus we to-day learn by far the most of what we know about the church, politics, discoveries, inventions (and we accept the information as wholly true), not through our own observation, but through the announcement of the discoverers and the eye-witnesses made through that all-pervading means of communication throughout the cultured world, the press. Without the press our knowledge of the present time would shrink to the knowledge of the little corner to which each one is confined, yea, yet more, to the knowledge of what each one himself sees, hears, experiences. This process of learning by means of tradition is also most clearly expressed in 1 John 1, 1, with reference to the New Testament events, as over against the contemporaries of the apostles, the latter being the first witnesses of these occurrences, fundamental witnesses because eye-witnesses. Numerous misrepresentations on the part of the press prevent no reasonable person from continually enriching his fund of knowledge by this means of partly oral, partly written tradition and from holding what is so delivered to be just as certain as if he himself had been an eye-witness thereof.

The contemporaries that are drawn by such tradition into joint knowledge of these things with the eye- and ear-witnesses become on their part witnesses of the *second* rank for others who are called to form the *future* generation, for the children. And these in turn become witnesses of the third rank for such as were not yet born at the time of the event itself. Thus the eye- and ear-witness of those first, principal witnesses spreads ever farther, through a succession of witnesses, more and more remote from the scene of that time, partly through the very variable, untrustworthy medium of merely oral tradition, which with each generation becomes more and more encrusted with subjective additions or disfigured by subjective omissions, and is continually subject to myth-constructing influences; partly through the firm, unalterable form of *written* traditional testimony, monumental and documentary. By this medium of tradition the widest abyss that separates the remotest future from the time of the transactions themselves is bridged over: but this medium is safe and genuine, therefore scientifically valid, only in so far as it is recognized by reliable documents. Tradition forms a kind of genealogical chain, which, like a galvanic circuit, brings our knowledge, as the last begotten, into communication with the past event that begot this knowledge. The spark of knowledge, having been

kindled by the fact itself in the consciousness of the generation contemporaneous with the fact, hastens along the circuit of tradition as along a galvanic conductor, from the time of the event down until *our* present time and brings us, the youngest member of humanity, into fellowship of knowledge with the oldest. Thus genuinely historical tradition is nothing else than the fountain of credible, thoroughly proved and abiding *knowledge* of an historical reality. This traditional knowledge, inherited by successive generations, dare not be confounded with legend, saga, which would have to avoid the light of the keenest test (criticism). In this connection we once more emphasize, that only as fixed in *writing* can this historical tradition be called tradition in the scientifically tenable sense.

This tradition dare not be confounded with hypothesis. Tradition, in *our* acceptation of the term has nothing in common with such subjective assumption. It is a real objective *knowing*. The traditional statement that the writings delivered to us from the past under the name Cæsar, or Virgil, or Tacitus, is an assertory, categorical judgment of the past, which comes to us with the claim of authority and demands of us faith and confidence. This both fatherly and authoritative power over us is exercised by this traditional testimony as the medium which sets us in rapport with the eye- and ear-witnesses of the special fact, so that through this medium not the opinion, but the *certainty* of those eye-witnesses passes over upon us. The certainty of the eye- and ear-witnesses, then too the control the whole generation of contemporaries of an event could and must exert upon the written or oral declarations of the eye-witnesses, and in correspondingly larger measure as the fact was great, far-reaching, wonderful — these two factors bring about the solidity and the trustworthiness of tradition. Each following generation exercises control over the declarations of the departing generation and then passes on farther the traditionally delivered historical treasure of knowledge, which is faithfully to be preserved, in written form, in a shape that will not be disfigured. That is tradition in the full scientifically valid sense, in accordance with which the whole profane historical science, relying upon tradition and upon it alone, stands and works. For him that regards this tradition as naught, that grants to it, as subjective *opinion* of our ancestors, as much right, or even still less right than, the conjectures and fancies of the negative critics, all objective foundation of historical science ceases just as for the philosophical sceptic in his domain, when he con-

siders the ideas of space and time, the logical laws of thinking as purely subjective or perhaps as a movement of ever-changing matter. One stands in the air. Everything is opinion. There is no valid knowledge. Scepticism can quibble at every document as "possibly" fulfilled. And when the negative criticism, in order merely to secure a basis for its work, lets stand under all circumstances certain remnants of what has traditionally been delivered, remnants of the codex, as Baur has done in the New, Wellhausen in the Old Testament, that is unprincipled arbitrariness.

Of course not every tradition is scientifically and validly authoritative. It depends entirely on whether the chain of tradition can be *proved* to reach up to the events, so that the first member of the chain could receive and then farther circulate the genuine report of the eye-witnesses, which report was controllable by the contemporaries. A tradition, the recording of which in writing took place one hundred years after the events, is, to say the least, very suspicious, because in the course of a hundred years' oral transmission the formation of myths will inevitably occur. Strauss and Baur took their stand on this point, and they were not refuted until it was scientifically shown them that the gospels were written in the first century by contemporaries of the events. If, however, fully a period of 400-800 years lies between the events and the recording of the same, as the collective body of critics, even the believing ones, of the Old Testament maintain, then the scientific value of the tradition is equal to naught. Then the critical hypotheses have equal right. The door stands wide open for them. The truly scientific critic must *test* the historical chain of criticism to ascertain its strength. Three parts especially belong to this examination: 1. That to him and his time there has really been delivered a book of that special content and bearing the names of those specific authors; 2. that the book in his hands be the same as that delivered to his generation; 3. that the same text and the evidence respecting the author be followed back, upon the basis of *recorded* intervening members found to be genuine, from the time of the critic through all preceding generations even to the time of the composing of the book in question. The actual *concurrence* of these three points, which is to be proved, forms the firm, scientifically valid basis for all historical science. The cornerstone of this whole process of certification is honesty on the part of the generations delivering the tradition, and, on the part of those receiving and of the one last receiving, faith combined with an examina-

tion of the moral quality of those handing over the tradition. Thus an historical certainty is not reached by a merely intellectual road, but demands, in order to its formation, the recognition of the two *moral* ideas: honesty and faith.\* This whole certification rests then, in the last instance, on those foundations without which the entire moral world, all intellectual intercourse between men, yea every even common interchange, the whole marital, domestic, political, social sphere of human life would be impossible. For without honesty and faith no man can live beside his neighbor in peace. Distrust as a *principle* introduces disunion everywhere and begets a *bellum omnium contra omnes*, which is the character of hell.

Remove the intellectual moral bond "*Treue und Glaube*" from the world and it will be shattered. And the first thing to be destroyed in science will be historical certainty. The whole past will sink into night for us. The *purely* logical understanding without the moral basis of an objective and a subjective *fides* will invariably lead even the greatest scientific genius into the black depths of scepticism, if the man — is *consistent*. The mere understanding can doubt everything and actually *has* doubted everything, even its own existence.

If, now, sound criticism must necessarily take its stand on historical tradition, in order not to float in the air, then it must first of all place itself upon the traditional codex with its *text* in order to deserve the name of objective historical science. That the text of the Pentateuch, about which we are here concerned, has passed through the hands of many transcribers before reaching our hand is beyond doubt. We no longer possess anywhere the originals. The oldest Hebrew manuscripts to which *we* have access are from the 9th century *after* Christ. Thence it follows that more so than in the case of the New Testament texts, whose oldest manuscript reaches back to about 200 years of the time of the originals, we must, in the case of the Pentateuch and of the rest of the Hebrew Bible, be prepared for many departures from and corruptions of the text through human hands. For we have no promise of a *providentia specialissima* which exempted the copyists from all human weaknesses. Various readings do actually exist. Since the time of the Masorites, who fixed the Hebrew text with the most painfully precautionary rules, a further corruption of the text is well-nigh impossible. Thus since the first

---

\* *Treue und Glaube*.

century after Christ we are in possession of an assured text-tradition. On the other hand, the text as the Masorites themselves received it in the manuscripts, from the time before Christ, affords no such certainty as does the Masoretic. Yet, strangely, the text of the Pentateuch presents a consonant-text which will reach back even to the time of Ezra. Cf. Dr. König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1893, p. 14-52. Even the text-critical supplements to the Bible-translation of Dr. Kautzsch prove that the text of the Pentateuch remained comparatively the most correct. And so Old Testament text criticism is perfectly justifiable, just as much so as that of the New Testament. But an examination of the various readings discloses the fact that neither sacred history nor dogma has in any way been essentially touched by these corruptions and uncertainties. Of course the endeavors, above all of Dr. Klostermann, to establish on the basis of translations, especially of the LXX, a more reliable text than that offered by the Masorites, can have only conjectural value, aside from certain fortunate results of more objective importance. Gesenius has shown that the Hebrew text can not be amended by the Samaritan. There appear many wholly arbitrary alterations, e. g. the departures from the Masoretic text in giving the ages of the patriarchs. And the text of the Septuagint is not a mere translation, but a corrupt Massora text arising from lack of understanding and critical arbitrariness, as even Graf expressly declares.

Textual criticism can, in the main, accomplish nothing better than what the accurate and conscientious text-criticism of the Masorites 1400 years ago brought about with manuscript material at hand of which we to-day possess nothing. In the Masorite text we of the present time have a firm foundation under our feet. The various readings which, like grains of sand, appear therein, make us value so much the more the firm freestones of the text.

However justifiable the task of "lower criticism," which has to do with the text, may be, we still dare not expect that it will ever rise, for the most part, beyond the worth of conjectural criticism, because in the domain of Old Testament documents transcriptions, in the sense and of the worth of the New Testament documents, do not stand at our command to carry us back so far that an examination independent of the results of the accurate Masoretic text criticism could be possible.

The criticism of the modern learned man, when it takes into account things as they are, has every reason to exhibit more reverence than it has hitherto to the text- tra-

dition, instead of exercising itself in worthless conjectures of fancy and subjective acumen. The *traditional* form of text will always remain the firm foundation for Old Testament science. However, we have not to speak now more specifically concerning the task and the method of the lower or textual criticism. We are rather concerned here about the principles and the method of the so-called "higher criticism," i. e. the examination not of the text, but of the *origin*, of the Pentateuch as to time, place, author, and of the contents as to history and doctrine, or laws, namely as to their *credibility* and *genuineness*.

Does the Pentateuch proceed from the time of Moses and from Moses himself, and are its contents credible? That is the question in "higher criticism." It is the question respecting genuineness and trustworthiness. Also in the task of higher criticism the right starting-point can be only the objective, namely tradition.

For as the codex with its text, so also the name of the author is with it delivered to the present by past generations. This is the case in the sphere of the profane. For instance, the writings of Tacitus, Cicero, Thucydides are handed over to us with the express information that these persons are the authors of those works and that the latter proceed from the time of the authors named. That is not a mere hypothetical declaration which can claim only an equal value with, or even a still smaller value than, the hypotheses and conjectures of modern acumen. We do not herewith express the humble opinion of uncritical patriarchs, which must yield to the more highly cultured, more critically schooled posterity. No. Tradition in *our* sense is an *authority* which has the *right* to claim commandingly reverence and piety. It is in the proper sense the authoritative voice of the fathers to the children and stands under the protection of the fourth commandment: "Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother." In tradition a noble blessing devolves as an inheritance upon future generations, a *knowledge* springing from eye- and ear-experience of the same, which knowledge without the testimony of this tradition would have sunk eternally into the sea of the past, out of which even the greatest mind with all the means of acumen could not lift it. If, e. g. Virgil's *Æneid* had descended to us without this traditional testimony regarding the author, the keenest critic would not be able to puzzle out to which personality this poem owes its existence. Here, then, paternal faithfulness addresses itself to child-like faith, the one

has moral rights toward the latest-born, and the latter owes moral duties toward the former. Criticism that superciliously takes its stand on the vain ego instead of on tradition, without which the ego would be a blank page, is irreverential rudeness. Accordingly, the first moral duty of science is: Trustful acceptance of the voice of tradition. Then the right to examine this voice in accordance with profane-critical principles comes to the fore to ascertain whether this voice goes back to the time of the events and unbrokenly sounds with the same power through all generations. This is the testing of the members of tradition's chain as to whether they are firm and continuous, in other words, *good* guides, or whether they only represent a late tradition. That is "external" criticism.

a) The external testimonies. "External" criticism, in the case of the Pentateuch, examines the post-mosaic literature from Joshua to Chronicles and asks: Do the post-mosaic writers testify that at their time this book was in existence and that at the same time with the book the certainty concerning the author of this book was delivered to them from the period preceding their own, and how far back does this double testimony reach? If it can be proved that this testimony goes back to the threshold of the Mosaic period itself, then this external proof, which the so-called external criticism has to furnish, is valid according to profane-critical principles. But the farther off the testimony concerning the existence and the authorship of the book of the Thora lies from Moses' time, by so much the less would such testimony of written tradition be valid and binding in the scientific sense. All depends on whether this external testimony reaches as nearly as possible to the period of origination which is claimed for a book, so that an undoubtedly certain knowledge concerning the origin can be ascribed to the first witnesses appearing for the genuineness of the book. Profane philology in its critical investigations holds fast to the very same principles. Cf. *Dr. Iwan Mueller, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft,"* 1. Band, B., *Hermeneutik und Kritik*, by *Dr. Fr. Blass*, especially p. 264-272, *Kritik des Echten und Unechten*. Dr. Blass says, p. 267: "The well-known passage of Pliny nearly suffices for proof of the genuineness of the dialogue of Tacitus. Plato's laws are firmly secured by the Aristotelian testimony."

Thus, as over against the Tübingen school, the positive criticism of a Thiersch, an Ebrard, a v. Hofmann, a Tischen-



dorf and others has directly proved, by this method of external proof, the genuineness of the gospel of John. And this proof is scientifically unimpregnable, just as is the proof for the Apocalypse and the four Pauline epistles, which that noted sceptic himself let stand because otherwise he would have had no basis for his constructions. For the testimony for the gospel of John extends in Irenæus through Polycarp to John himself. If, however, it can in like manner be proved that the certainty respecting the authorship of Moses in the case of the Pentateuch exists not only in the post-exilic period, which is conceded by the most negative of critics, because this is all too evident from the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles,\* but that already Joshua's time, the period immediately touching on Moses' life-time, had knowledge of the *sepher thorat Mosche*, as appears from Joshua I, then it could only be objected yet that *possibly* the "book of the Thora" that Joshua knew was not the same as that of Ezra. If, however, the intervening literature exhibits an acquaintance with this book, and there nowhere appears a trace that constituent parts were yet added gradually thereto, then the human-scientific proof, agreeable to profane-philological principles is furnished that this book is the same here and there, and any other opinion is and remains only an unprovable conjecture. This proof for identity is produced when the authors appealed to as witnesses exhibit indubitable *citations* from or *references* to the book in question, even if they do not expressly name it. Whoever would not make all profane literature totter will find himself obliged to measure the Pentateuch by the same standard which he applies to a Cicero or a Tacitus. This external testimony is sufficient for the representatives of science, otherwise they must prefer, what of course one *can* do, to call in question the whole of profane literature.

---

\* When Kautzsch quite recently wanted to explain the designation of Ezra as *sopher* to be, not "scribe," but *author* of the Pentateuch, or editor of the same, that explanation must be registered as an unfounded fancy.

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

---

Vol. XX.

APRIL, 1900.

No. 2.

---

## THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,  
COLUMBUS, O.

### CHAPTER XII.

#### III. THE PRACTICAL, HORTATORY PART (xii. 1—xv. 13).

##### A. *The General, Fundamental Exhortation*: Verses 1. 2.

In the evangelical spirit of the New Testament St. Paul, notwithstanding his apostolical dignity, fraternally exhorts his readers to regulate their lives in accordance with the great love that God has shown to all men, which love has been described in the first, doctrinal, part of our Epistle. What God has done for men is always the basis and source of what a Christian does and is to do. The manifold manifestations of divine compassion and mercy are his main motive. The sum and substance of his life is the presenting of his body, the organ of his activity here on earth, a sacrifice that consists and shows itself in a new life accompanying the death of his old man, and hence is in the highest sense holy and acceptable to God, since it is that service of God that really alone is worthy of man as a rational being, even the sacrifices of the Old Testament being merely symbolical and pedagogical, as far as their external form was concerned (1). To serve God in this way requires that we

---

V. 1. *οὕτως* in accordance with, and on the basis of, what has been set forth so far. The verb *παρακαλέω* means, in the first place, to call to one's side, and then, as this may be done for various purposes, to invite, exhort, admonish, call upon, ask, beg, comfort; anyone of these significations, except the last, is suitable here. "Through the mercies (compassions) of God": the

Christians do not even externally conform ourselves to the life and conduct that is characteristic of men that simply live for this world, but that we rather be transformed in our very being by having our minds given a new principle and direction so that we always are most concerned to find out what God wants us to do as that which is good, and well-pleasing to Him, and perfect (2).

various and manifold manifestations of the mercy and compassion of the true God are used by the apostle as a means (*διὰ*) of arousing the Romans to gratitude, which gratitude is to be shown in doing what he exhorts them to do in what follows. *Παραστήσαι*: this verb also in classical Greek has the signification of presenting a victim for sacrifice. "Living": in contrast with the typical and symbolical sacrifices of the Old Testament where the animals offered had to die. "Holy": cleansed and free from sin, dedicated and devoted to God. "Your reasonable service": accusative of apposition to the whole preceding clause: presenting our bodies in this way is the reasonable service that we should offer to God in opposition to mere external or also ceremonial service. The worship, sacrifices, and service of heathen are not at all becoming man as a rational being, and the service of the Old Testament was preparatory; hence the service of the New Testament required here is the only one really and in the strictest sense becoming man.

V. 2. "Be not fashioned in conformity with this world, but be transformed by the renewing of the mind": the two verbs differ, in the first place, in the prepositions with which they are compounded, and, in the second place, in the nouns from which they are derived. Whilst *σύν* denotes an intimate connection, *μετά* c. accus., on the contrary, expresses a transition from one condition to another; and whilst *σχήμα* (from *ἔχω* fut. *σχή*—*σω*: *habitus*) is the whole outward shape and figure that is more or less accidental, *μορφή* is the form as an expression of the inner essence, and therefore essential. The *μορφή* must always conform to the nature and essence, so that the change of the latter involves that of the former, and reversely, whilst the *σχήμα* may vary without any change of the nature and essence (comp. Phil. 2, 6. 7). "World": *αἰών* (from *αἰεῖ*=*αἰεῖ*) means duration, of time (never-ending duration=eternity); of life; of this world: the world as it moves in time, manifests itself in time, the course and spirit of this world (the "Zeitgeist"). Comp. Eph. 2, 2; Gal. 1, 4; 2 Cor. 4, 4. *Νοῦς* (irregular gen. of *νοῦς*): mind (comp. 7, 23). *Εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς*: the purpose and object of the renewal of the mind to whose sphere the "proving" pertains. *Τὸ ἀγαθόν* x. τ. λ. is best regarded as in apposition to *ὑπέλλημα*, not as an attribute, since we can hardly speak of an "acceptable," or "well-pleasing," (*εὐάρεστον*) will of God, it being a matter of course that God's will is well-pleasing, viz. to Him. "Good": serving God and our fellow-men. "Perfect": *τέλειος* having attained its end and purpose (*τέλος*), lacking nothing.

B. *Exhortation to Modesty in the Faithful Use of the Gifts Bestowed: Verses 3-8.*

The general exhortation considered above must be heeded if the special exhortation given now is to be obeyed, since our heart by nature is the reverse of modesty and humility. And this special exhortation is of such importance to the welfare of the Church that Paul appeals to his authority as an apostle in order to enforce it (comp. 1, 5); nor can anyone maintain that it has no reference to him. It consists in this that everyone should beware of thinking more highly of himself than a man of sober and modest mind ought to do; for our self-estimation should be in accordance with that measure of practical faith that God has imparted to each one. Faith as the only means of appropriating the merits of Christ is of the same value and efficacy in every Christian, possessing forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation in every case and to the same extent; but as the source and mainspring of Christian life and activity it differs in power and efficacy, being stronger and accomplishing more in the one than in the other, as we readily see when we, for example, compare Paul and Luther with the great multitude of true Christians (3). For the spiritual body of Christ consisting of all true Christians is in this similar to the human body that its different members have not all the same office and hence not all the same gifts and capacities; consequently, though in their relation to Christ they form

---

V. 3. "For": the following admonition presupposes as its necessary basis the transformation by the renewal of the mind; hence the necessity of the former is a reason for that of the latter. "Through the grace": by means, by virtue of it; this grace enables him to speak with authority. "To everyone": whatever his ability and position may be. The following infinitives present a paronomasia that may be imitated in this way: "Not to be high-minded above that which he ought to be minded, but to be so minded as to be sober-minded" (*Alford*); or, "Not to think (of himself) more highly than he ought to think; but so to think as to think soberly," or, modestly (*R. V.*). *Ἐξάστω ὡς*: this uncommon position emphasizes the first word which is dependent on *ἐμέριτσεν*: distributed. "Faith" is also here taken by *Weiss* as "trust and confidence in divine grace, without which the latter cannot communicate these its gifts, in order to intimate, that also this (confidence) itself is an effect of grace, and hence the endowment, in its ultimate source, is a gift of divine grace that gives no occasion for self-conceit." But the trouble is that the Scriptures do not bear out the assumption underlying this explanation, viz., that the communication of the gifts meant here (vv. 6 sqq.) is dependent on the measure of saving faith (comp. Matt. 7, 22 sq.; 1 Cor. 13, 1 sqq.).

one and the same body, in their mutual relation to each other they are members that differ from each other and with their different gifts are to serve each other (4 sq.). The gifts, then, that we have differ according to the free grace of God that distributes them according to His wisdom; and each one is to use his own gift in his proper sphere, and use it faithfully, being satisfied with what has been given him. If prophecy be his special gift, that is, the inspired declaration of the will and word of God, he must be careful to act according to the analogy of faith, to keep within the bounds of the revelation of God as it already has been laid down in His Word for the faith of man, not mistaking his own imaginations and enthusiastic notions for divine inspiration. (6; comp. Jude 3. 20;—Matt. 24, 11.

V. 4. *Πρᾶξιν*: activity, action, function, business, office.

V. 5. "In Christ": in our connection and communion with Him, in so far as we are in Him. *Τὸ δὲ καὶ εἰς: καὶ εἰς* in later Greek, *κατά* being treated as an adverb, = *καὶ ἕνα*: every single one; the article *τό* makes the whole expression a noun in the accusative of relation: in so far as the condition of the individual is concerned = individually.

V. 6. *\*Εχοντες δέ* the question is how to connect these words, whether with the preceding verse, construing them with *ἔσμεν*, or with what follows, beginning a new sentence with them. If the former construction is adopted, the adverbial phrases following the mention of the diverse gifts ("according to the analogy of faith", "in the ministry", "in the teaching", etc.) could not be understood as expressing admonitions regarding the proper use of these gifts, but would have to be regarded as simply modifications in the same way as "according to the grace given us" in the first clause of our verse. Now those that adopt this construction (e. g. *Weiss*) have to concede that from the second clause of verse 8 on the speech is exhortatory so that with the adverbial phrases a verbal form, viz. the imperative corresponding with the preceding participle, has to be supplied. But then no good reason can be given for denying that the same supplement should be made in the two preceding clauses, seeing that *εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων (παρακαλῶν)* with the verb that is easily supplied, viz. *ἑστίν*, is really the same as simply *ὁ διδάσκων (παρακαλῶν)* would be, and that *εἴτε* with the participle, denoting the possessor of the gift, forms the transition from *εἴτε* with the accusative expressing the gift to the simple participle denoting the possessor. Moreover, everyone feels that the expressions "whether having ministry in the ministry," or "whether a man be a teacher in the teaching," make no good sense, but sound tautological. Hence we side with those that begin a new sentence with verse 6. That necessitates supplying several verbal forms, but only such as are clearly indicated by the context. After the first, general, clause in verse 6 we can supply: let everyone modestly and conscientiously use that gift which has been given him. Paul does not expressly say this because in the rapidity

24; 1 Thess. 5, 19-21). If he have the special gift of serving the Church in the care for the sick and needy, and the like, he ought to devote his time and attention to that; the same holds good with regard to those that have the special gift of uninspired teaching (7), or of exhortation and consola-

of his thinking, after having mentioned the gifts in general, he immediately particularizes and adds to each particular gift the appropriate admonition, thus leaving no room for completing the general statement. — "Prophecy": the gift or office of a prophet, that is, a man to whom God directly, by inspiration, has revealed His counsel of salvation, and what is connected with it, for the sake of communicating it to his fellow-men; prediction of future events is merely something accidental and incidental, namely, in so far as God's counsel refers to the future, as to the greatest extent it did in the Old Testament. Comp. 1 Cor. 14, 1 sqq.; Eph. 3, 5; 1 Tim. 1, 18; 4, 14; Acts 11, 27 sq.; 15, 32; 21, 10 sq. That no mere preaching or teaching of the Gospel is meant here is evident from verse 7, where this activity is distinguished from that of a prophet and mentioned as the special office of the διδάσκαλος (comp. Acts 13, 1; 1 Cor. 12, 28 sq.). Προφήτης (from πρό-φημι: to speak publicly, as the interpreter of divine oracles) is the Septuagint and New Testament equivalent for נָבִיא: he to whom and through whom God speaks (comp. Gen. 20, 7; 18, 17; Deut. 18, 15 sqq.; Amos 3, 7). 'Analogia: corresponding, proper relation, proportion, analogy. "Prophecy must stand in the true relation to faith, correspond with it" (Cremer). And "not the subjective measure of faith is meant here, but an objective norm for prophecy". If that is the case, as it certainly is since a norm of prophecy is required by the context and nothing subjective can be such a norm, "faith" must be taken in the objective sense = the sum and substance of that which God has revealed for us to believe unto our salvation, fides, quae creditur. And Jude 3, 20 proves that πίστις is used in this sense already in the New Testament, as e. g. Keil, Huther, and Burger concede. And that prophets had to be on their guard so as not to be deceived themselves nor deceive others by regarding themselves as inspired when they were not must be gathered from 1 Thess. 5, 19-21, whilst Matt. 24, 11. 24 shows that not everyone that seems to be a prophet in reality is such. After πίστεις the verb corresponding to προφητείαν may be supplied, viz., προφητεύωμεν: let us prophecy.

V. 7. With διακονίαν, as with προφητείαν in the preceding verse, ἔχοντες is to be supplied; after ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ we may supply ὦμεν: let us be = let that be our sphere. In a similar way we supply after διδασκαλίᾳ and (v. 8) παρακλήσει the verbal form ἔστω: let him be = let him consider that his sphere of activity. In εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων (supply ἐστίν: is the one endowed with a gift) the apostle changes the construction, using in the singular the participle of the verb denoting the exercise of the gift, instead of the accusative of the noun expressing the gift or office together with the plural participle ἔχοντες, ὁ διδάσκων being essentially = ἔχων διδασκαλίαν. Διακονία: the gift and office "of those who attended to the business affairs of the Church, who looked after

tion. He that is able, and therefore also in duty bound, to communicate of his possessions to the poor (Eph. 4, 28), is to do this in singleness of heart, without any selfish designs; he that has the gift and office of leading and directing his fellow-Christians, as a presbyter and the like (1 Thess. 5, 12), ought to be zealous, not growing weary and careless because of the trouble and vexation connected with the faithful performance of his duties; he that has the special gift of showing mercy and attending to the necessities of the suffering should do this with a cheerful heart and face, never getting out of humor, and thus doubling the value of his gift or work (8).

C. *Exhortation to Love our Neighbor:* Verses 9–21.

Our love for our fellow-men in general should be without any hypocrisy, neither simulating nor dissimulating anything. If that is the case, we shall hate and abhor that which is bad and ruinous, wherever found, even in those we love, and in the same way cling to whatever is good and profitable (9). As to our love for our fellow-Christians in particular, that is to be a tender affection, as between brethren; with regard to mutual honor and esteem we should be the first in giving it, thus setting a good example to others (10).

---

the poor and sick, and attended to similar duties" (*Boise*). Comp. Acts 6, 1 sqq.; Phil. 1, 1; 1 Tim. 3, 8 sqq.; 1 Pet. 4, 11; Rom. 16, 1. 1 Cor. 12, 28 their duty and work is called ἀντιλήψεις "taking hold of" for the sake of assisting: help, ministration.

V. 8. Παράκλητον: comp. verse 1. This gift has special reference to practical Christianity whereas "teaching" has more to do with the theoretical side. The former appeals especially to the heart and will, the latter to the intellect. With ὁ μεταδιδούς the mode of expression again changes, taking the simplest and briefest form, to which the preceding construction is the transition. After the participles (without εἶτε) the imperative of the respective verb must be supplied, being the predicate of the former, viz., μεταδιδότω (προιστάσθω, ἐλεείτω): let him give (rule, show mercy). These three last clauses refer to general practical activity.

V. 9. After the first clause supply ἔστω: let (it) be; after the two following participial clauses, ἔστε: be (ye). "The love": viz., that is characteristic of a Christian, the only true one after the fall. Ἀποστυγοῦντες: turning away with horror and disgust—a very strong expression. Τὸ πονηρόν: the whole class and mass of that which is in active, injurious, opposition to the honor of God and the welfare of men τὸ ἀγαθὸν is the direct opposite.

V. 10. Τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ: dative of reference, which dative is also found in the next two clauses: "with regard to". "Brotherly love": comp. 1 Thess. 4, 9; 1 Pet. 1, 22; — Gal. 6, 10. Φιλόστοργος:

Wherever zeal and diligence is required in the performance of our duties, we should never be backward and lazy, burning in our very heart to do what is necessary, but never forgetting that the will of our Lord and Master, and not our own ideas and ambition, should be followed (11). As to the hope that a Christian has regarding his future salvation, he should always be of good cheer, notwithstanding all the troubles and afflictions of this earth; for he can and will patiently endure them if he only perseveres in taking refuge in prayer with Him who can and will give all the comfort and strength needed (12). Whenever our brethren in the faith, consecrated to God as we, stand in need of anything, we are to share in their wants by communicating to them of our possessions; and when in particular in times of affliction and persecution they shall lack shelter and food, we should be glad of every opportunity offered for meeting their wants (13). And upon those that bring persecution and affliction upon us we are not to call down curse and

the opposite ἄσπαργτοι (1, 31; 2 Tim. 3, 3). Also here, as in verses 11-13, with the adjectives and participles ἔσται: be (ye) is to be supplied.

V. 11. "Burning in our spirit": comp. Acts 18, 25. It is the very opposite of the preceding clause, but to be governed by the next one. "Serving the Lord": this reading, supported by the best manuscripts, is altogether fitting the context; the other reading, having *καίρω* for *κυρίω*, would mean that regard must be had to circumstances, thus inculcating Christian wisdom and prudence. In any case the three admonitions of our verse hang together. The same holds good of the next verse.

V. 12. The first two datives in this verse, in conformity with those in verse 10 and the first one in verse 11, are best taken as datives of reference: "as to hope (tribulation)". Ὑπομένοντες: bearing up under, enduring, not running away from. The dative τῇ προσευχῇ is dependent on προσχαρτεροῦντες (comp. Acts 1, 14; 2, 42; Col. 4, 2).

V. 13. Κοινωνέω c. dat. means to share in, partake in. Sharing, or partaking, in the wants, or necessities, of somebody is identical with regarding them as our own and acting accordingly (comp. 15, 27; Phil. 4, 14). "The saints" are here all Christians, not, as 15, 25 limited by the context, only those of Jerusalem. They are holy, in the first place and principally, because of the perfect holiness of Christ appropriated by faith and imputed by justification; in the second place, because of the true, though imperfect, beginning of a godly life made in and by sanctification. In both ways they are separated from the sinful world and dedicated to God. "Hospitality": literally, love of strangers (φιλοξενία) — a virtue especially necessary in those times of persecution (comp. 1 Pet. 4, 9; Tit. 1, 8; — 1 Tim. 5, 10; Heb. 13, 3). Διώκοντες: pursuing, striving after, cultivating diligently; not waiting till we are in a manner compelled by shame and the like.



punishment but rather the blessing of the Lord, namely, that they may be led to repentance and salvation (14; comp. Matt. 5, 44). Our brotherly love is also to show itself in the heartfelt interest that we take not only in the joys but also the sorrows of our fellow-men (15). Where there is brotherly love there is also harmony and unity of thought and endeavor with regard to each other, everyone being willing and anxious to do to the other what he has a right to expect of him; and that, of course, is possible only where there are no high pretensions and selfish aspirations, but where everyone is ready to share in lowly circumstances and occupations wherever it is necessary for the welfare of our fellow-men, and where no one thinks that he does not stand in need of the wisdom and advice of others (16).

Having shown how love of our neighbor should manifest itself in general, the Apostle now proceeds to set forth what our conduct ought to be towards our enemies, whereof he already incidentally spoke in v. 14. Man by nature is prone to render evil in return for evil (comp. Matt. 5, 43); but that is not the way a Christian ought to do. Moreover, he should always be concerned that all he does may be judged becoming and honorable by all reasonable men, so as not to give offence to anyone (17). It is, indeed, not

V. 14. The imperatives, like those to be supplied in the preceding verses, are those of the present tense, expressing what ought to be a habit and custom with Christians.

V. 15. The infinitives are best regarded as taking the place of the corresponding imperatives. In this way the infinitive of the present tense was used especially by epic authors, from Homer down. This mode of expression gives to the admonition the character of a watchword or maxim: "to rejoice with them that rejoice, etc.," — that shall be our duty and endeavor. We need not supply δεῖ: it is necessary.

V. 16. *Φρονοῦντες*: with the participles in this verse and the following verses again the imperative *ἔστω* is to be supplied (comp. verses 9 sqq.). "Think, have in mind the same thing" = be of one mind, "towards each other." "Think not, have not in mind, the things that are high", viz., for selfish ends. "But be carried away with the things that are lowly, or humble": do not withdraw yourselves from them, but rather be ready to pay attention to them when necessary. *Ταπεινοῖς* in conformity with *ὀφηλέα*, is best regarded as neuter and not as masculine. "Do not become wise with yourselves" = in your own opinion (comp. Prov. 7).

V. 17. "To no one": in contrast with "all men" at the end of the verse; it makes no difference who the man may be, whether former friend or life-long enemy. *Προνοοῦμενοι*: considering, or taking thought, beforehand; providing: "being mindful of, intent on, things that are honorable, praiseworthy, in the sight,

possible for a Christian to live in peace with all men, since there are always men that will have a quarrel; but that ought never to be his fault (18). Nor should he revenge himself, as natural man is so apt to do, wherefore St. Paul entreats his readers to give heed to his admonition in this respect. Whoever takes vengeance into his own hands, is usurping the office of God. If there is to be vengeance and wrath, it should be left to God; our wrath is not entitled to take the place of divine wrath and punishment (19). Our place and duty is to do good unto our enemy and thereby make him painfully ashamed of his enmity towards us (20). When we are attacked by evil and wickedness, we ought not to succumb to it by permitting it to lead us to do evil ourselves; but we should conquer the evil by returning good for evil and thus making friends of enemies (21).

judgment, of all men" (comp. Prov. 3. 4; 2 Cor. 8, 21). A Christian should not be indifferent to the judgment of his fellow-men, except where it is clearly opposed to the judgment of God. Comp. verse 19.

V. 18. "If possible" (after *δυνατόν* supply *ἔστιν*): this leaves room for an objective, external impossibility; "as to that which proceeds from you" = so far as depends on yourselves: this brushes away every title of subjective, internal, impossibility.

V. 19. "Avenge not yourselves": a more general precept than that contained in verse 17. He that avenges himself may use as a means something that is entirely good and lawful in itself, e. g., a legal suit; only the motive would make his action bad in the sight of God and sensible men. He that renders evil for evil does something that is bad in itself (*κακόν*). "Beloved": this endearing appellation is inserted in order to gain the assent of the readers by intimating that it is only love that prompts the exhortation. "Give room to the wrath": i. e., to that wrath that alone ought to have a place here, viz. the wrath of God (comp. 5, 9; 1 Thess. 1 10; 2, 16). This is evident from the following citation: "*To me belongeth revenge; I shall pay back in return*" (comp. Deut. 32, 35).

V. 20. "But": takes up the "but" in verse 19, introducing a thought that supplements the preceding one: if the evil-doer is to be punished that is to be left to God whose prerogative it is to inflict punishment; we, on our part, are to do the very contrary, as far as we are personally concerned, though our office, or the public welfare, or also the welfare of the evil-doer may constrain us to have him punished by the proper authorities. The citation is taken literally from the Septuagint translation of Prov. 25, 21 sq. "Coals of fire" are a symbol of penetrating pain, here of the pain caused by shame and contrition when contrasting the good received with the evil done.

V. 21. A brief summary of verses 19 and 20. *Ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ*: the good is the sphere in which we are to move in conquering that which is bad, or the weapon in which the power and strength of victory lies.

## HOW SECURE MORE STUDENTS FOR OUR COLLEGE.

BY PROF. M. LOY, D.D., COLUMBUS, O.

Some apology may be expected for the publication of the following article when the circumstances are learned under which it was prepared. The writer is so far from desiring to conceal the facts of the case that they are to him an incentive to publish the paper. He is one of a committee appointed by the Board of Capital University to report on the subject at its next meeting. Having been reminded of this by the Secretary, he was induced to consider the subject; and as he is chairman of the committee it was thought proper to reduce his thoughts to writing as a basis for the deliberations of the committee. The result is the following paper, which has not even been considered by the committee, much less by the Board to which the report was to be made. It is therefore only an article submitted to the "Magazine" on the writer's personal responsibility, without authorization by the Board or even by the committee. It is therefore an article for which the committee and the Board are no more accountable than any other members of Synod. The author accepts the whole responsibility.

But why publish it before the proper authorities have considered it? The answer is this. It is attended with some inconvenience and expense to secure a meeting of the committee to give the subject due consideration, and it was thought possible to avoid this burden by publishing the proposed report as an essay for examination. The members of the Board have usually not the time to devote more than a day to their meeting, which affords them little opportunity for mature reflection and prolonged discussion of subjects brought before them; and submitting the matter to them in print will enable them to consider it at their leisure and come to the meeting better prepared. To this may be added as a third motive for the publication, that the subject is one that concerns our whole Synod, that all the readers of this periodical may be presumed to have an interest in it, and that some may have valuable suggestions to make to the committee or the Board.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON SECURING STUDENTS.

The committee appointed by this Board to make suggestions in regard to better attendance of students at our college begs leave to submit the following:

Our Synod has provided for a much larger number of students in our college than has been secured. There was no waste in this, because provision for five requires essentially the same teaching force as the provision for fifty, different as the case is in housing and boarding them. It was rightly judged that with the means in hand or in prospect the best possible arrangements should be made to supply the needs of the Church, even though the larger provisions made at a small additional expense should be in excess of the immediate demand. Thus it has come about that we have not as many students as we could conveniently handle and not nearly as many as we should have to supply the need of educated men in the various departments of Christian work within the bounds of our Synod, to say nothing of the opportunities for effective work beyond these bounds. Accordingly your committee is fully convinced that strenuous efforts should be made to secure a larger number of students for our college, even if God's blessing on our efforts should be so great as to necessitate a larger expenditure of money for the accomplishment of our purposes in the establishment and support of this institution of learning.

This purpose should be clearly understood. It has perhaps never been so distinctly defined that differences of judgment are made impossible. But the whole history of our Seminary and of the extension of its work by the establishment of Capital University, of which it became a part with all its rights and titles of property secured, shows that the purpose of the founders and subsequent promoters of our institution was to serve the Ev. Lutheran Church as that is represented in the Joint Synod of Ohio. Our college, as well as our Seminary, was always regarded as an institution of the Lutheran Church and in the service of the Lutheran Church, and only on this ground were appeals made and are now made by our Synod to its churches for contributions of money to maintain and support it.

It does not follow from this that Synod meant Capital University to be only a school for the education of ministers in the Ev. Lutheran Church, and that the facilities afforded for education in the preparatory and college departments

should be offered only to those who have resolved to become ministers of the gospel in the Ev. Lutheran Church. That thought has come only because of the close connection between our college and Seminary, and the confusion has done harm to our college work which probably only a local separation of the two institutions can heal. Synod did mean in the organization of our college to make better provisions for the education of our ministers, and the prime motive was evidently to furnish the requisite preparatory education for admission into the theological seminary and the necessary equipment for its work. In all the action of Synod, so far as we can see, it has never lost sight of this as the principal object of our college. But it would be gross injustice to all concerned in the establishment and management of our institutions to assert that nothing else was ever contemplated. Our Synod always recognized the importance of education for all the walks of life and all the interests of the community, although it never adopted the absurd notion that culture would never change nature—that a cub trained would come to anything but a bear, or that a rascal polished would be anything but a rascal. Ours is a Christian Synod that recognizes Christ as the source of spiritual life, and never expected such life from any other source. But it saw and still sees that an educated man, when by the grace of God his heart is right, can exercise a power for good in the community of which the uneducated man is incapable. It was therefore concerned in the education of men whose gifts and preferences were not in the direction of the gospel ministry. They could serve God and their fellow-men in other callings, and they could render more efficient service with the aid of a higher education. Hence provision was made for the wants of others seeking such higher education than those desiring to enter the ministry, so far as this could be done coincident with the main purpose, but therefore always in subordination to this principal object, and always in all its arrangements with a view to serving the Church.

Your committee deems it necessary to call these things to mind as the reason for their inability to meet the expectations of some brethren by the suggestions offered in this report.

In the first place, we must recommend such a change or such an enlargement of our curriculum as in our judgment would be needful to put us on a level with richer and larger institutions of learning, and enable us to enter into competition with any of them or all of them in the struggle

for patronage. In our present condition and for our present wants there is no necessity in reason or in faith to strain our powers in the effort to form a great university in rivalry with institutions that have millions at their command. That would probably only bring us ridicule and contempt with failure in our legitimate work. Nor would we have a right to ask our people to pay the expense of such a vain-glorious venture. Even this, an ambitious goal to be attained by degrees in the arrangement of our curriculum, does not under the circumstances seem to us legitimate, because it loses sight of our calling and the purpose for which our college was instituted and savors not of Christian humility. Let us be content to serve God in all our arrangements, not permitting our judgment to be warped by dreams of great success as the world views success, but continue to provide for a Christian education as it is needed preparatory to entering the Seminary only so far as is consistent with this main purpose for the Christian education of young men whose tasks and talents lead and qualify them for callings and stations requiring more learning than the ordinary school affords. Our plea for patronage should not be our equality with rich and large universities in facilities for scientific studies and choice of courses for special pursuits, but our superiority in the principle of all sound education, in accordance with which all teaching and discipline are governed by the truth in Jesus and aim at His glory. There are larger faculties, and grander buildings, and more extensive laboratories at other institutions, and we should not deny it, or seek to rival them; but we should impress on our people the folly of trying to gain the world and running the risk of losing the soul or of selling our birthright for a mess of pottage. What is essential as the preparation for any of the learned professions is needed also for the study of theology, and that we can furnish to all who apply, so that there is no excuse for members of our congregations who send their sons to schools at which they are in danger of losing their faith, though they may seem to have greater advantages in the study of science, which is but too often science falsely so called, because, apart from the errors in its instructions, it vainly pretends to know more than God.

In the second place, we cannot recommend general advertising and indiscriminate solicitation of students. As we cannot cater to popular desires for advanced theories and corresponding methods that are the rage of the day, so we cannot consent to hold out inducements which must

lead to disappointment. We cannot furnish what many crave; we should not try to furnish it, even if it lay within our power; we should not make the false impression that we propose to furnish it. On the contrary, we would have it distinctly understood that our college as well as our Seminary is a distinctively Christian school which, under the auspices of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Ohio, is designed to educate young men for the service of Christ, and that accordingly the Word of God as given in Holy Scriptures is in all things the rule for the teachers and the students alike. Instead of suppressing this and entering into rivalry with other institutions in the race for capturing students, we would rather emphasize it as the great advantage offered over many other institutions which, in subordinate matters of numbers and equipments, are far in advance of us, but but are deplorably lacking in the main thing, without which education is a failure. This may tend to keep some students away from us, but it will draw those that we want. We do not wish to conceal what this implies. There are some that we do not want. We have, even without much advertising, obtained some who were no credit to us, and no doubt would, by extensive advertising, secure many of the same sort. There were some who had no gifts for higher learning, and who came to us because other schools had declared them incompetent and dismissed them. There were others who, though they did not lack intellectual endowment, were morally so depraved that their presence was not only a constant trouble to the faculty, but a constant danger to the students and thus a constant menace to the school. The Board will readily see why we have no desire to recruit our forces from such material and cannot deem it wise to publish general solicitations which, under existing conditions, necessarily involves such hazards. What would be the use of all the students and money and prestige acquired, and of all the labors and sacrifices of our teachers and Synod, if at last we failed in our purpose to serve our Savior with and through our college?

Let us be content to serve our Lord in the way of humility which He has prescribed, and look to Him alone for the prosperity of our institution. In doing this we can be assured that, however little we may be in the eyes of the world which admires the glory of other institutions' wealth and equipment and exploits, we shall accomplish something to the praise of our Maker and Redeemer, and thus in our

poverty and modesty accomplish unspeakably more than many an institution can achieve in its riches and pride.

But we do not mean that therefore no efforts should be put forth to secure students for our college. On the contrary, our conviction is that the more clearly we see our calling and understand the purpose of our institution to serve the Church, and thus see that this calling is different from that which so many other institutions recognize, and understand that our purpose is different from theirs, the more earnestly will we be concerned to fulfill our calling and carry out our purpose by strenuous efforts in that direction. If even with our humble means we can afford a better education for our people than is offered elsewhere, we would not be faithful if we did not exert ourselves to let them know it and induce them to avail themselves of its benefits.

To this end we suggest, as tributary to the end in view: That the pastors of our churches, the teachers in our parochial schools, the editors of our church papers, and the professors in our institutions be earnestly requested to exert their influence, wherever opportunity is offered, to induce young men to attend our college. This request is not based on the assumption that we have higher interests at stake in the maintenance of our institutions of learning than other members of Synod, but on the conviction that their calling affords them special facilities for doing the work that is so important for our welfare, and that their superior advantages in this respect carry with them special duties.

1. The ministers of our congregations are official members of Synod, and are presumed to know what the whole body has jointly agreed to do in its faith and love for the glory of God and the welfare of men and are expected to teach the people in regard to these as well as to other things pertaining to godliness. This implies that the work of our institutions should have a place in the routine of instruction given in congregational meeting as well as from the pulpit and in pastoral visits. Pastors have opportunities of promoting our educational work in larger measure than others. They can urge it upon the people from the pulpit as among the duties to be performed, they can explain it and maintain it in the business meeting of the congregation and enforce the divine will; they can make individual application in their pastoral visits to members of their churches who have children fitted for higher education or have it otherwise in their power to send us students. May we not reasonably expect them to do this work for the sake of the



cause in which they are called to labor, which in this as in all other respects looks to the glory of our Lord and the salvation of men? Your committee is of the opinion that a better insight on the part of our ministers into the relations between our college and their vocation in the Church would be productive of greater activity to secure students. Important as the raising of money is for the work of our institutions, this will manifestly fail to accomplish the purpose of Synod, if men are not found who will avail themselves of the benefits offered.

2. Teachers of parochial schools can do much toward securing students for our college—much more, we think, than their vocation affords them opportunity to do for its support in the matter of money. They have children under their care for years, and thus become acquainted with the mental and moral gifts of the boys committed to their charge. Some of these have natural endowments above the average, and are not lacking in gifts of grace which awaken the desire to use them in the service of God and man. May, not these, or at least some of these, by prudent suggestion and direction be induced to improve their talents by attending college and preparing themselves for larger service in one of the learned professions? In the teacher's intercourse with his pupils there is ample opportunity for the exercise of such influence, and of meeting doubts and difficulties which may arise in such pupils' minds; or which may, when the thought is once entertained of entering a college, be suggested from without by the solicitations of other schools offering apparently superior advantages. That a boy has no impulse to study theology need not stand in the way of the teacher's activity to gain him as a student of our college. God wants learned men to serve Him also in other professions, and wants them educated in the fear of the Lord that this service may be rendered well. Hence the teacher has ample reasons to make persistent endeavors to secure students for our college, though they declare from the outset that they have no inclination to study for the ministry. We have no doubt that teachers would gain for us many a student if they would fully realize the importance of the work and their power and opportunity to promote it.

3. The editors of our periodicals have a wide field and an extensive work. This extends over the whole Synod, and their influence extends even beyond its boundaries. And they have a calling commensurate with the field and the work. Therefore they have larger opportunities than

any other members of Synod to advocate the cause of Christian education and to impress on our people the duty of working for Christ and the Church in educational as well as in all other respects, and of bringing home to their hearts and consciences the obligation that is upon them as Christians, and especially as Lutheran Christians, to give their cordial support to our college not only by furnishing the necessary money, but also the necessary men, through whom the object of their contributions in money is to be attained. Two of the undersigned have been editors, and would not be understood as designing to pass censure on those who have the management of our periodicals without declaring themselves in the same condemnation. They desire, according to the instructions given by the Board, to make suggestions as to ways and means for the increase of our number of students. And they cannot fully discharge this duty without directing attention to the opportunities and facilities afforded by our periodicals, which are established for the very purpose of promoting our synodical work. That work is primarily to proclaim the gospel as the only means of saving lost souls and defending it against all adversaries, but just on that account secondarily to promote all measures and institutions which, according to the Scriptures, look to the accomplishment of this purpose. Our papers would therefore not fulfil their mission if they did not constantly keep our college work in view and repeatedly impress its importance on the readers. The editors have not the opportunity of our readers and teachers to confer with individuals either to persuade them to enter our college or contribute money to support its work, but they have the great advantage of a much larger audience than either to give ear to their presentation of the subject and the motives which should induce our people to give their support in men and money. This is by no means the main thing which the editors of our papers should have in mind, but it is one of the principal things among the instrumentalities looking to the accomplishment of the main purpose, and sight of which should therefore never be lost in editorial work.

4. We have put the work of our professors for the securing of students last, because in the respect of personal appeal to our people, which seems to be the desire and the hope of many who are sincerely concerned for the welfare of our college, it is in our estimation least; though in another respect it is very great; namely, that of doing good work

in the school, that thus the reputation of our college for thoroughness and efficiency may be established and maintained and extended. Diligent study and sincere devotion to the duties of their calling will accomplish more on their part than any other effort which they could put forth. We do not mean that the opportunities which are occasionally offered them to secure students or to address the people in the interest of our institutions should be disregarded, even though embracing them should now and then make it necessary to deprive a class of its regular recitations. But we do mean that it would be unwise to burden our professors with a duty in this respect which conflicts with their high calling as teachers. This would only and necessarily cripple the work which imposing the burden was designed to promote; because it would hamper the professors in the prosecution of their duties and thus render them less efficient in the exercise of their proper calling as teachers, and because the loss thus entailed on our institutions would be greater than any gain which even the most sanguine would reasonably expect from their work of canvassing for students. Whilst our argument does not apply directly to the vacation period, when the work of our professors in congregations and among the people would not immediately interfere with the work to which they are especially called as teachers, we have doubts whether even then it would not be the better policy, justly assuming that they love their calling and recognize the importance of their fidelity, to leave the question to their own judgment whether, after embracing the opportunity which vacation affords for rest and recuperation, they will devote the time to further preparations for the duties of their professorship, or spend it in congregations in the interest of the institution, or divide it between the two important objects. A man who has no hearty love for the educational work to which he is called and is not willing to devote his talents and energies to the accomplishment of its purpose, should not be called or should not be retained as a professor; one who has been called and shown his devotion to the work should be left free to promote it in the way which his judgment dictates as in his case the best.

5. Our circumstances are such that we deem it expedient to suggest the propriety of appointing an agent to superintend the whole work in the field and give his time and thought and strength to the furtherance of our work. The circumstances which we have especially in mind are of

two kinds. In the first place, there is a system of education in vogue which does not recognize the truth supernaturally revealed in Holy Scripture as a feature in its work. It has the general sentiment of the community in its favor. It has the support of the civil government. It has an abundance of money at its command. It has equipments that surpass our attainment. It has numerous agencies to solicit students, who are often gained under the pretence that the education offered will cost them nothing. All this, and more, is against us. In the second place, our agencies can, in the nature of the case, only partially reach the requirements of our work. Our pastors can reach only those within their own parish, and many of them have never realized the importance of our work and therefore have never adequately used the opportunities presented them for its furtherance by soliciting students. Our parochial teachers are limited in their activity to the few pupils in their schools who manifest more than ordinary gifts, and even when there are such manifestations the regular duties of their calling, and in some instances lack of interest in the work often prevent the exercise of such energies as are necessary to win young men for our college. Our synodical editors can wield an effective power in the instruction of our people in regard to our educational work and in pressing the claims of our institutions on the people generally, but they cannot do the special work that is often needed to remove the trouble and difficulties that arise in special cases. Our professors can and should do some soliciting, but as their time for this is mainly confined to the vacations, when the interests of the school in their estimation may be better promoted in other directions and when often other duties imposed by Synod require attention and time, this can be but a small portion of the work necessary. Therefore we venture to suggest the appointment of a permanent agent with a fixed salary, who shall devote all his time and all his energies to the promotion of our educational work and to the superintendence of all the activities looking to its support in men and money.

Accordingly we offer for the consideration of your Board the following resolutions: Resolved

1. That our pastors be requested to preach at least once a year on our educational work, and to bring its purposes and its needs to the notice of the people at congregational meetings and in their pastoral visits.

2. That our school teachers be requested to embrace every opportunity to induce gifted boys to pursue a course of higher education and in co-operation with their pastors to win them for our college.

3. That our editors be requested, in addition to such accounts of our school work as properly belongs to the department of news, to furnish at least four articles each year looking to the instruction and encouragement of our people in the work of our institutions.

4. That our professors be requested to render all such assistance to the other agencies mentioned for the furtherance of our object as lies in their power without detracting from their special work as teachers, cheerfully consenting to visit congregations and writing articles for our papers when asked to render such services.

5. That an agent be appointed at a salary of \$1,000 per annum, besides the payment of all necessary expenses, whose duty it shall be to superintend the whole work of raising funds, securing students for our institutions, furnishing information for our people, and for generally promoting our educational interests by voice and pen, visiting congregations whenever this seems advisable, writing wherever this seems conducive to the end.

In regard to this last resolution which, as it creates an office under the control of this Board with an expenditure that would presumably have to be met from the synodical appropriation to Capital University, the work which our agent may be able to do in behalf of our other institutions being a labor of love that is not included in his special calling, so far as the securing of students is concerned, gives us an additional salaried officer, the question necessarily confronts us, In what relation shall he stand to the faculty of our institution and to other officers of synod? The latter part of the question is decided by the fact that synod has not appointed him, that he is not directly accountable to synod, and that he must therefore be restricted to the powers vested in this Board. But these give him ample range to promote the work of our institution throughout our whole synod, whose institution Capital University is and which has given full control of the institution to this board. We need, therefore, have no fear of exceeding our authority or encroaching on the rights of any other officer of synod by the appointment of an agent for our special work. But this still leaves open the question as to the relation in which such agent shall stand to the faculty, who also hold their

offices by appointment of this Board. In this regard we have two suggestions to make, either of which seems to us practicable.

(a) The agent appointed shall be required to devote his time and his energies to foster the work assigned to this Board, and shall labor under its direction for the accomplishment of its purposes, being wholly under the government of the Board and accountable to this body alone for his actions. This would place him as an equal power by the side of the faculty, giving each jurisdiction in their own fields. The danger of conflict in this regard could be remedied by making the agent subject to the faculty when the Board is not in session, and guarding against all dangers of disturbances from this source by reserving the right of appeal to the Board in any case of disagreement in judgment, the faculty's decision being authoritative until reversed by the higher authority. The official name of this agent shall be Financial Secretary of Capital University.

Or, as a substitute for a, which we regard worthy of special consideration,

(b) The president of our college shall be such agent, with all the duties mentioned above, the salary remaining as at present and his work in the school being adapted to his new duties. In our estimation this would require

1. That the president be released from all teaching in the college except so far as he shall, in coincidence with the judgment of the faculty, think this needful for the furtherance of the work to which he is called, either by delivering occasional lectures to the school, or by teaching a special subject to a class, the time and labor of which must not interfere with his proper vocation.

2. That the discipline of the institution, from which the president is thus relieved, be committed to the dean, who shall thus have the superintendence of the school in all its internal and external affairs, combining the duties hitherto divided between the president and the dean.

Our apology for extending this report to such an unusual length is the conviction that some points which are herewith brought to your notice have not received due consideration, and that some of the main difficulties with which we have to contend have been overlooked. We have given the subject serious thought, and the best results we have been able to reach are herewith respectfully submitted.

## THE SCHOOL OF THE REFORMATION.\*

BY REV. R. C. H. LENSKI, A. M., ANNA, O.

The University of Wittenberg was founded by the Elector Frederick the Wise in 1502, the same year in which Luther rose to the Master's degree in the University of Erfurt. The date is significant. What promise could there be that this incipient institution in the miserable little city of Wittenberg would rise to any prominence, when the land was filled far and near with older and even ancient universities, wealthy, renowned and magnificently patronized? What could this new, weak school accomplish in competition with the proud and imperial Sarbonne at Paris or with Bologna and Padua in Italy, to say nothing of the long line of universities on German soil? Certainly the Elector could have had but moderate expectations. Yet the Providence of God used this humble institution of learning in carrying out His own wonderful plans, and raised it up to become the greatest of all the universities in its day, Paris and the Italian schools not excepted, in fact, so great that now, almost four hundred years after its founding we rise up to call blessed the School of the Reformation.

When Wittenberg was established the great battle between the old and the new learning had already been fought out to victory in the other universities of Germany, France and Italy. Scholasticism was evidently doomed. Humanism had reason to look forward to a long and illustrious reign. In some places the struggle had been severe, and in fact was still going on, and here and there a university came close to destruction in its throes. Considerable of the old learning still remained, but beyond a doubt it could not last. When Wittenberg came into existence it was spared this struggle, which might have wrecked it in the very start. What of the old went in in 1502 was bound to fall away in the space of a few years, and a clear road opened before the new.

But Wittenberg was not to become the crowned champion of Humanism, however highly such a position might have flattered its noble patron. A greater battle than any fought hitherto, and a greater glory than any achieved by the progress of Humanism, awaited the young university.

---

\*Delivered as a lecture to the students of Capital University, Columbus, O., by appointment of the Capital University Lecture Association.

Wittenberg became the center and fountain-head of the Reformation, and gave to the world more than the labors of Scholasticism had ever ventured to undertake, or the fondest dreams of Humanism had ever thought possible, namely, the clear and everlasting truth of God with all its quickening, elevating power.

Our present aim is quite limited. We desire to follow only one thread in the wonderful web. A glimpse of

#### THE SCHOOL OF THE REFORMATION

is all we can attempt, showing as best we may something of the old school-life and of the tremendous progress achieved at Wittenberg. And I take it that students must be interested in student-life and work generally, and students who belong to the Church of the Reformation in the achievements of the great School of the Reformation. This the more, since we are the direct inheritors of the progress of learning attained at Wittenberg.

To appreciate the remarkable advance made by the young school in Wittenberg we will do well to take a glance at the days when Scholasticism reigned and when Humanism came in. And we will be led to marvel that men trained under such antiquated and miserably inadequate methods could ever have risen to the leadership achieved by the School of the Reformation.

The school year generally began in October. It was broken by many saint and festival days when there were neither lectures nor disputations. The longest interruption was the vacation, beginning in the early part of September and lasting till the middle of October.

Students must have risen early in the old days, for the ordinary lectures began at about 6 in the winter and at about 5 in the summer, continuing till 8 or 9. The intention was to begin work with the dawn of day — *Morgenstunde hat Gold in Munde*. The extraordinary lectures, that is the added or special lectures, were placed either into the afternoon at 4 or 5, or after the *prandium*, breakfast, at 10 or 11.

We enter with the boisterous student crowd, several hundred streaming into the lecture-hall. The teacher is seated at a desk, the students on benches, the richest and most prominent in front. For we must not forget that there were wide differences; besides simple scholars there were bachelors, masters, doctors, perhaps, and dignitaries, many



who themselves lectured and taught in the university. But in places benches were a luxury; the students simply sat on the floor which was strewn with straw or rushes. This was done in order to remove all occasion for pride on the part of the rising generation, and to keep them sweet and humble. The aim, undoubtedly, is good even to-day, although I would not recommend the means.

The old universities were nothing like ours with their arrangement of professors and students. They were organized more like the old trades-unions with their apprentices, journey-men and masters. The lowest rank consisted of simple scholars; the next in order of those who had taken the first degree, the bachelors or *baccalaurii*, who were also in places permitted to teach under certain restrictions; the highest rank was held by the masters, *magistri artium*, corresponding somewhat to our doctors of philosophy, who had the right of teaching in their own and, as a rule, in other universities. In the higher departments the gradations were similar. Bachelors of Theology were expected to lecture on the Bible. The masters were termed *Licentiates* and *Doctors* and had full authority to teach and dispute. All these different classes, even including some of the highest degrees, attended lectures, and of course took part in disputations. Melancthon had many doctors and *magistri* among his hearers, some of whom taught regularly in the university. Jerome Schurf, the great jurist of Wittenberg, was among the pupils at Luther's lectures. We find the same thing on every side.

University instruction assumed a two-fold form, the lecture (*lectio, lectura, praelectio*) and the disputation. The lecture aimed to go through a text-book, taking up section by section. The disputation aimed to define, support by argument, and defend against attack what had already been learned. The center of academic life was undoubtedly the disputation, for which the lecture served as a preparation. To know a thing was not enough, one had to be ready to present, argue, and defend in public the thing he knew. Ability in logic and dialectics was the great *desideratum*.

These frequent disputations must have been highly dramatic. What the tournament was for the knight, the disputation was for the scholar. The comparison is doubly appropriate, when we recall that the scholar as well as the knight wore the same ponderous armor and bore the same unwieldy weapons in the lists where the test of ability was made. A *quaestio*, or several — we would call them theses

— were proposed by the disputant, and he was held to maintain and defend his propositions against the attacks of stated opponents. While the disputation raged, the lectures were silent.

The fullest glory of university life is found in the *disputatio quodlibetica*, set for some special time in the year. The entire university put on its gala dress; the faculty of arts, the masters, bachelors and scholars, headed by the dean and the rector, and accompanied by the members of other faculties, all in official garb, repaired in a long procession to the hall. The *magister* whose turn it was to appear as *quodlibetarius* proposed two *quaestiones principales*, which were thereupon controverted by two bachelors. Then he proposed a *quaestio* to each of the *magistri* present, one with arguments, the other without. To the first each of the *magistri* responded by at most three *conclusiones* and the same number of *corollaria*; to the second each responded in brief. The whole procedure moved in the ancient forms of logic and scholastic dialectics. These academic disputations undoubtedly produced the great historic disputations during the Reformation, the contests between Carlstadt and Eck, Luther and Eck, Flacius and Striegel, and others, each lasting for days.

To relieve the strain put upon the brains of the participants in the regular disputations, a sort of mock disputation followed, on some witty, comical, or highly ridiculous subject. Most of them are unmentionable, but one we may name: "*Ebrietas, quae Germanis fere omnibus non minus vere quam contumeliose ab Italis reprobatur,*" etc. — drunkenness. And another: "*Monopolium philosophorum, vulgo die Schelmenzunfft.*" In these mock disputations the coarse and vulgar disposition of the times found full vent, yet, let it be said honestly, to the grief of many men.

These academic battles often lasted for days. They were full of life and vigor — syllogisms, conclusions, sophisms, etc., fell like hail-stones. The scholars shouted, pounded the benches, stamped their feet, as they passionately defended this or that side of the *quaestio*. It was often necessary to remind them that they were in *scholis virtutum*, and not in the tavern.

The first step in the old university education was called the *Trivium*. The object was, for one thing, to teach the use of the Latin language. The most renowned of the text-books was the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei,

which set forth, in 2660 leonine hexameters, and in 12 chapters, grammatical forms, the construction of words, syntax, metre and prose. The whole thing was learned by rote and expounded by the teacher in the vernacular. This made a course of about seven years. We must remember that this grammar did not go back to the Latin classics, and did not follow the use of speakers and writers, but argued everything philosophically from the *ratio*, with endless subtle distinctions in logical order. No wonder that thousands broke their brains, and then had little for their pains. Alexander's *Doctrinale*, I fancy, was something like certain modern grammars built in Germany — only, of course, much more so! — almost impossible for beginners to fathom, blocking by their endless intricacy and sublime difficulties the road they should open.

Combined with Grammar in the *Trivium* we find Rhetoric, the *Ars dictandi*, or *dictaminis*, versification and prose style as used in letters, state documents, etc., at that time.

But the chief thing in the *Trivium* was undoubtedly Logic or Dialectics, to which Philosophy proper was added. And here we meet Aristotle who controlled this part of university education completely. He had been translated into poor Latin, and was as good as unknown in the Greek original. The beginning was made with the *Ars vetus*, or *Logica vetus*, handling the subjects of substance, quantity, quality, relation, place, time, position, conduct, action and passion; proceeding to the *Logica nova*, treating of the syllogism and of extended proof; reaching at last the *Topica*, concerning true syllogisms and fallacies. To this was joined philosophy, metaphysical, natural and moral, presenting quite a complete view of the world, with happiness given as man's great aim, and virtue as the means of reaching it; that is virtue emanating from human ability, therefore closely allied to the papistic Pelagian doctrine.

In this treatment of philosophy the teacher throughout proceeded analytically and by deduction. The start was always made by setting up some aphorism or principle which was taken for granted. Facts were never investigated for the purpose of building up conclusions, induction was never attempted. The *quaestiones* or propositions were stated, the four causes were elaborated, the divisions and subdivisions were entered, till each contained but a single or simple thought. These were then restated, circumscribed, put into the form of a *quaestio*, and argued pro and con. Finally the teacher gave his own view. It must, however,

be understood that explanations, glosses, citations and intricate elaborations darkened the whole procedure to such an extent as to cloud and obscure the original ideas completely. The text literally disappeared, opinions in vast array baffled and confounded the learner. Impossible, trivial, useless questions were argued at interminable length. Everything was treated *a priori* instead of seeking facts; theories were set up and abstruse deductions often enough went to the full length of the absurd. This also lasted for years.

Butler's caricatures of the *Trivium* in *Hudibras* do not go so very far beyond the reality. His hero was a thorough scholastic.

"He was in logic a great critic,  
 Profoundly skilled in analytic;  
 He could distinguish, and divide  
 A hair 'twixt south and south-west side;  
 On either which he would dispute,  
 Confute, change hands, and still confute.  
 He'd undertake to prove, by force  
 Of argument, a man's no horse;  
 He'd prove a buzzard is no fowl,  
 And that a lord may be an owl,  
 A calf an alderman, a goose a justice,  
 And rooks Committee-men and Trustees.  
 He'd run in debt by disputation  
 And pay with ratiocination.  
*Att this by syllogism, true*  
*In mood and figure, he would do.*

For rhetoric, he would not ope  
 His mouth, but out there flew a trope;  
 And when he happened to break off  
 I' th' middle of his speech, or cough,  
 H' had hard words ready to show why,  
 And tell *what rules* he did it by.

\* \* \* \* \*

He knew the seat of Paradise,  
 Could tell in what degree it lies;  
 And, as he was disposed, could prove it,  
 Below the moon, or else above it;  
 What Adam dreamt of, when his bride  
 Came from her closet in his side:  
 Whether the devil tempted her  
 By an High Dutch interpreter;  
 If either of them had a navel:  
 Who first made music malleable:  
 Whether the serpent, at the fall,  
 Had cloven feet, or none at all.  
 All this, without a gloss or comment,  
 He could unriddle in a moment,  
*In proper terms, such as men smatter*  
*When they throw out and miss the matter."*

The *Trivium* was followed by the *Quadrivium*, which comprised arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. The chief text-books were the *Tractatus de arte numerandi* of John of Sacrobosco, the books of Euclid, and for astronomy, which was a favorite study, Sacrobosco's *De Sphera*, and for the calculation of the almanac his *Computus ecclesiasticus*; and finally for astrology we must not forget Ptolemæos' *Quadripartitum*. The *Quadrivium*, however, was not cultivated at the universities to compare with the *Trivium*. For instance, at Prague during one year there were twenty-seven subjects from the *Trivium* and only six from the *Quadrivium*.

When now we endeavor to sum up the attainments of a *magister* in the old scholastic days, we find that he knew Latin — in spite of the grammar — logic and mathematics. He possessed no knowledge of any classical literature, no history, no natural science. He was far removed from the life of the people as such; he was no observer who could draw conclusions from what he saw and experienced. He approached and argued every question *a priori*, beginning not with facts and investigations, but with some philosophical dictum. And thus we come to understand, why the sum of actual human knowledge was not increased during so many years of excessive labor. Men of this stamp could not go beyond their tether.

But I must hasten to tell you how the new scholar was received and initiated when he entered the university. He had to pass through an important symbolic ceremony, even in the presence of the dean himself and of the representatives of the university. This consisted chiefly in sawing off the horns of an ox-hide, which had been thrown over the young man's head; in cutting off his hair with a monstrous pair of shears; in cleansing his ears with a great club, breaking out his fangs, filing his nails with a huge file, etc. These serious operations were interlarded with words of explanation and admonition. Then followed a pompous oration; and the ceremony was closed by pouring a glass of wine over the head of the initiated, and wishing him joy to his new station. When he arrived he was a *beanus*, which signifies *Schulfuchs*, which is, being interpreted: *Beanus est animal nesciens vitam studiosorum*. After the operation he was counted as one of the *studiosi*.

I have endeavored so far to sketch briefly the old or scholastic study of the arts. It is patent at a glance how far we to-day have advanced beyond the old learning in

matter as well as in method. But what of the course that led us hitherward?

The first development was through Humanism. It began in the revival of learning in Italy, and soon spread northward. Humanism discovered the buried treasures of the Latin and Greek classics, and gradually introduced them into the universities. This called for the cultivation of a new language, Greek; and when language and literature became prominent, Hebrew was added. But the introduction of the classics was a momentous forward step. The finished style and form of these master-pieces worked like a leaven. The ponderous text-books of scholastic days, the intricate and endless elaborations of the old method were sloughed off. New text-books appeared. Instead of the old Grammar, the *Doctrinale* of Alexander, which compelled the learners to wade through poetic rules and reasons for years, without really getting at the language itself, the new learning hastened to introduce the reading and study of the master-authors themselves. With the new spread of classic literature the art or fine composition in prose and verse revived. This was the day of poets, that is of the humanistic Latin poets, and there was many a laurel for the singer's brow. History, too, began to come forth from its long-time obscurity. And a bright dawn full of promise spread over university education in general.

To be sure, the old was not at once overcome, the new had to face much opposition. Luther at Erfurt studied the old Grammar and dialectics, and read but comparatively little of the newly introduced literature. Even on entering Wittenberg as a teacher Luther began by expounding Aristotle quite in the old way. Melancthon at Heidelberg found something more of the new. He writes: "While yet a boy I was sent to the university, but the young men were taught scarcely anything except *garrula dialectice* and *particula physice*. Of his own accord he read the poets, also history and drama; he had been taught Greek, and followed this up most assiduously till he gained some proficiency. At Tübingen he found an excellent teacher of Latin and a fine lecturer on poetry and eloquence. Greek and Hebrew, however, he continued almost entirely by efforts of his own. Gifted to a most remarkable degree, we are told: "He gave attention chiefly to Greek and Latin literature, to philosophy, history, eloquence, logic, mathematics, heard the theologians, the lecturers on law and medicine, and

read Galen so carefully that he could repeat most of his works from memory."

The case of Melanchthon is repeated with variations by almost all others, who rose to prominence in the Reformation. Scholasticism refused to yield up its rights; Humanism had to be sought by the efforts of those who could not content themselves with the old worn-out system. Jerome Schurf, the noted jurist of Wittenberg, was trained according to the old *Trivium*, and laments that to learn the declensions and conjugations in the old way consumed almost ten years. In Tübingen, like Melanchthon, and in Italy he found more of the new learning, and even after his call as professor to Wittenberg he pursued his studies at the feet of Melanchthon.

John Apel, a witness at Luther's wedding, and at one time professor of *jura* at Wittenberg, entered this institution as a student as soon as it was founded. He tells us: "Bisanher haben wir dermassen in iure studiert, dass unter dreissig gelarten iuristen nit einer ein rechten lateinischen brief schreiben kann, wie wol got lob die iungen gesellen sich zumals unterstehen vorhin latein, darnach iura zu studieren, und sunderlich zu Wittenberg. Das mag man dem melachthon dangken, wie wol auch nit alle." He too, mostly by work of his own, rose to the height he attained.

From the start, however, Wittenberg must be reckoned among the strongholds of Humanism. The very statutes governing the university declared: "The laurel of the poet must be esteemed as equal to the master's degree." A long line of lesser Humanists graced this institution during the first years of its existence, and these were constantly strengthened by their intercourse with like-minded men at Erfurt. We may mention in particular Georgius Libutus Daripinus, Sbrulius, Marshalk, the Thuringian poet, Phachus, Scheurl, and others. Herman van dem Busche, a notable Humanist, delivered the oration at the opening of the school. It was not long till teachers for Greek and for Hebrew were sought and gained. The position of Wittenberg is thus plainly indicated. And we may venture the opinion, that, if a higher hand had not intervened, this university would have stood in the front ranks of Humanism, especially after Melanchthon began his important work, adding to the school the luster of his learning. Yet if Wittenberg had remained a representative of Humanism, it would never have bridged the gulf that separates our schools now from those of old.

Before following the next and most important step it may be well for us to note briefly the actual progress and results attained by the entrance of Humanism. Scholasticism had not been fully vanquished. Humanism had flowered beautifully, but had not reached its fullest fruition. There were indeed men who may be termed complete and perfect Humanists, like Erasmus for instance, Ulrich von Hutten, Reuchlin, and others. Basing our judgment on men of this stamp, we may say that Humanism tended to a highly cultured life, an aristocracy of learning and letters. It revolutionized methods, it brought forth excellence of form and a finished polish. It also widened the scope of learning and university education in several directions, and made the path of learning pleasant. But there were things it did not do, and in fact could never do. Humanism left the deeper questions of life untouched; its attainments were restricted almost entirely to the Humanists themselves, and produced scarcely any perceptible effect on the people generally. The universities, the halls of learning were somewhat changed, but the great world otherwise was just about the same. All the newly discovered authors, all the newly introduced methods, all the newly achieved results of Humanism lacked the vital thing, the vivifying, regenerating power from above. It was much, to possess instead of the barbarous translations of Aristotle, the perfect Greek original; instead of an interminable Grammar, the choice gems of ancient poetry, history and philosophy. But in all this new material from Greece and Rome there was nothing for the soul, nothing for the millions of souls who still dragged on in the same old muddy road of mediævalism. Humanism was bound to remain barren as long as it left the highest faculties of man untouched. And it is clear to-day, that even the treasures which Humanism did possess could not be made to yield their best and fullest returns without that one treasure which Humanism did not possess.

The reign of Humanism was brief. Its results were quickly appropriated by a higher and a thousandfold more fruitful movement, and this centered in Wittenberg, the School of the Reformation. I need not repeat the story of the entrance of the Gospel. My object is to follow the course of learning, to note the results achieved at Wittenberg, and flowing from this fountain throughout all the land, filtering down into high and common schools, even into the hearts and homes of the nation.



Luther entered Wittenberg in 1508, when the university was six years old. The light of the Gospel had just begun to illuminate his heart; the wonderful development he attained still lay in the future. He began by teaching the dialectics and physics of Aristotle as prescribed for him. But from the very start he departed from the old notion, that Aristotle was infallible, and the farther he went, the more this philosopher sank for him to a level with other writers, whose books must be read and studied with discrimination and criticism. Soon Luther advanced and took the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. It was now his duty to teach the Bible. But in that day teaching the Bible was only a step towards the highly prized right of laying the Bible aside and teaching dogmatics, namely the scholastic system of Petrus Lombardus. In fact, many passed beyond the Bachelor's degree without ever touching the Bible even for a short time; notably Carlstadt. When Luther advanced beyond the Bachelor's degree, when he was made Doctor of Theology, he again broke away from the old ways, and lectured on the Psalms, Romans, Galatians Hebrews, and Titus. His beginnings even in Exegesis were quite scholastic, but he advanced rapidly; yet it was a long way from this first work of Luther to our present finished course in theology embodying the labors of many men and many years. Luther began especially to pursue the study of Greek and Hebrew, taking a course entirely new for a doctor teaching theology, in fact, the only true course for all theologians worthy of the name. Little did he know how far this new path would lead, and to what golden fields it would bring him.

As far as Luther is concerned, we must remember that he taught in the faculty of theology, and not in the arts. The latter was the field to which Melanchthon devoted most of his attention. But in estimating the influence of Luther, in and through the School of the Reformation, on learning generally and on the art of education especially, we must remember that the regenerating power came from above, from theology, or rather from the Bible, which is the true source of all wisdom. From this foundation Melanchthon also drew, and it was Luther who opened the way for him. Far beyond theology and Bible study proper the influence of this true wisdom extended. The Humanists had put the Greek original of Aristotle in the place of its barbarous Latin translations. They practically left his mediæval authority untouched, but Luther threw him from the throne, and set him down where he actually belonged. "The tricky

old heathen," as he called him, "teaches that the soul is mortal." His other errors were exposed. Thus the idol was shattered, the fetters were broken, not for theology alone, but for the arts likewise. It was the same with the Sentences of Petrus Lombardus. Their dominion was doomed when the Bible was placed in their stead. Luther thus cleared the way for science to leave its old moorings and sail out upon the sea of new investigations and discoveries, guided by the compass of higher truth. This was an achievement far beyond the abilities and possibilities of Humanism.

Moreover, Luther broke the way for a truer education in all branches of knowledge by his writings; in fact, his liberating and rejuvenating influence extended down all along the line to very childhood and the home itself. He began by reminding the monks of their forgotten duty of educating the young. Then by making every Christian, however humble, responsible for his own salvation, he gave to every person a mighty impetus for gaining the necessary instruction and knowledge. All his devotional writings were a stimulus to education even for the common people. And as they stirred up the hearts and minds of the uneducated masses, setting their thinking faculties into operation, so they aroused all the world of learning, from the scholar and bachelor on up to the doctors and dignitaries. Of prime importance in this regard is the translation of the Bible into German. Humanism had never dreamed of such things. While the poets polished their rhymes and the orators filed their phrases, Luther, discarding the fine art of polish and perfect form, held aloft the substance of truth, and gave to all learning its true purpose and aim. And here at a bound the transition is made from both Scholasticism and Humanism to modern learning, with all its subsequent world-wide and wondrous development. Where the Scholastics defined and divided and distinguished and disputed in an endless round of logic and dialectics; where the Humanists grew eloquent and lauded their laurelled literature, the School of the Reformation tested the true worth of things themselves, finding much that was admired false and unsound, and opening the way to discover all that men have really attained hitherto. This is *the* great merit of the School of the Reformation, and especially of its foremost master, Luther.

But aside from the religious element proper and its

more direct influence, Luther was a man for education of the right sort in every department. It was he who urged the art of catechisation strenuously. While the poets sang empty Latin verses with all their might, Luther sought men who could cultivate German songs. The Latin fellows are gone, but the German inspiration has brought forth an astonishing fund of melody. Zezschwitz calls Luther the "Vater des Anschauungsunterrichtes," because he defended the great educational value of pictures when fanatics and legalists would have destroyed and discarded instead of cultivating them. In his letter addressed to "His Imperial Majesty," he urges most powerfully the needs of education, both as far as the studies themselves, and as far as the regulations for higher schools are concerned. He insists on the study of languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, the *mathematicas disciplinas*, the histories. His epistle, "To the Aldermen of all German Cities on their Duty of Erecting and Maintaining Christian Schools," is a ringing appeal and argument for the cause of common education. Likewise he urges the establishment of good libraries. In this way Luther's powerful influence went out constantly for education all along the line. In no department was his influence unfelt. He exceeded everything that had been done hitherto. And starting as he did from the Gospel, his influence proved fruitful far beyond anything even possible hitherto. Scholasticism cared only to educate the supporters of the church, and these in its own peculiar and narrow way; Humanism cared only to maintain an aristocracy of culture and literature; the Reformation gave education to the people, and at the same time guided the educated into truer, deeper and more abiding channels.

Melanchthon is called the Preceptor of Germany. He stands pre-eminent as the teacher in the school sense of the word. Trained on humanistic lines, and eager to pursue them to their utmost end, he opened his work at the School of the Reformation by the inaugural on "How the Studies of our Young Men should be Improved." He at once began to practice what he preached. The difficulties of grammar were greatly lessened. Homer takes his place beside Paul to Titus. Luther himself eagerly improves his opportunity of re-enforcing his Greek. But Melanchthon finds in Luther learning of a more valuable kind, he embraces the truth of the Gospel. The house of Melanchthon became a very school itself, and a school wherein the masterly teacher himself prepared all the text-books, the "Hand-

book of Elements for Boys," a Latin grammar, an Instructor in Greek literature for boys. In theology this Preceptor produced, as the result of lectures on Romans, the first Protestant Dogmatics, his *Loci*, the forerunner of hundreds of works that followed. He was the author of the "Instruction for Visitators," for which Luther wrote the preface. One part of the "Instruction" treats of schools, and sets forth sober and excellent plans for their organization and conduct. In the midst of labors for the church Melanchthon's diligence is incessant for philology and philosophy. Books tread on the heels of books — now the *Dialectics* of Aristotle in a new edition, a *Commentary* on his *Ethics*, an *Exposition* of his *Politics*. Again he issues *Epitome philosophiæ moralis*, and following this *De Anima*. Then come Annotations to Cicero's *Offices*, *Laelius*, *Orator*, *Topica*, *Orations* for *Archias*, *Marcellus*, *Milo*, *Murena*, *Caelius*, *Roscus Amerinus*, *Sulla*, *Caecina*, *Ligarius*, *Deiotarus*, *Sestius*, the *Manilian Law*, the *Philippics*, the letter *ad familiares*; Annotations to *Sallust's Catalina* and *Jugurtha*, to *Tacitus' Germania* and *Quintilian's Institutiones Oratoriae*. In the same way he takes up *Homer*, *Hesiod*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Theogenes*, *Pindar*, *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Terence*. And so we might go on and speak of his archæological investigations and publications, of his philosophical works, *Elements of Rhetoric*, *dialectic dissertations*, etc., etc. The lectures of Melanchthon embraced the entire circle of learning in his day, and everything he touched he helped to clarify, improve and elevate. Who would not willingly for this alone bestow on him the title *Teacher of Germany*? But still there's more to follow:

Melanchthon became the organizer of higher education throughout all Germany. As his hand directed, so did schools everywhere shape their course and hold it for many a year. Wittenberg itself put off the remnants of Scholasticism under the rectorship of Melanchthon; later on he gave the theological faculty new statutes; and shortly after remodeled the entire university in all its branches. Quite a number of other universities followed opinions sent them by Melanchthon, or took the constitution of Wittenberg as their model in the construction of their own.

Many Latin schools were organized according to Melanchthon's advice. Six years after entering Wittenberg we find him present at the opening of the Latin school in Magdeburg; the year after, he and Luther organized a similar school in Eisleben. In the next year Melanchthon

opened the high school in Nuremburg. He was appointed to superintend the Schools for Princes in Pforta, Meissen and Grimma. In fact, wherever a new institution of learning was started, wherever an old institution was remodeled during the time of the Reformation—and there were many—the Preceptor of the School of the Reformation was either present in person, or gave aid by his advice, or guided by his influence. It was thus that he became the Teacher of all Germany, and it is thus that we begin to see something of the surpassing glory of the School of the Reformation.

We are not surprised to see hundreds of scholars thronging the lecture-rooms of Melanchthon. They came from every corner of Europe; and they carried the learning they received broadcast over the land. The steady work thus done for years can hardly be estimated too highly. Melanchthon's pupils were found teaching in almost every school. Luther and Melanchthon served to guide and inspire them. Encouraged by Melanchthon Valerius Cordus, Menander and Mathesius gathered their herbariums, and the latter his collection of metals; Cruciger pushed his astronomical and physical investigations, and August Schurf his anatomical studies. One of Wittenberg's professors sought out Copernicus, made his discoveries known, and induced the publication of the work which set forth the revolution of the heavenly bodies. And last, but not least, the acknowledged four greatest educators of the sixteenth century were scholastic sons of Melanchthon; Valentin Friedland in Goldberg, John Sturm in Strassburg, Michael Neander (Neumann) in Ilfeld and Jerome Wolf in Augsburg.

And having said this much, it only remains to add, that the entire development of science which has taken place since, and which has made Germany especially the land of learning, the teacher of nations, rests on the shoulders of the Reformation; which in other words is saying, that it has gone forth chiefly from Wittenberg, the School of the Reformation.

To present my subject as it should be presented, I ought to stop and show the detail at every turn and exhibit every link in the diligent and extensive work accomplished. That would result in a volume. In a lecture I have been able to touch only upon the general outlines, but I hope these have been sufficiently suggestive, at least to point out

the true position of the School of the Reformation in the chronicles of learning.

I am loth to leave this subject without a few closing words as regards this university. Capital University aims to be a School of the Reformation where Wittenberg was the School of Reformation. Certainly it is sometimes awkward to have great ancestors — people will persist in expecting you to live up to them — and what is worse, people have a right to expect it. Now I am bound to say for myself, that my wishes and hopes for this school are that it may follow completely the road marked out by Wittenberg of old — I would have this not merely a School of the Reformation, say one of the smallest and most insignificant, but one of the Schools of the Reformation in its day, the leader of them all. I have purposely refrained from treating theology especially; we know what Wittenberg has done in that line. But Wittenberg was not merely a Seminary, it was a university; and to say nothing of law and medicine, what we to-day would call its college, namely, the department of the *Artes*, became a power in the land. Who will count the *magistri artium* that passed forth under the hand of Melanchthon? And what of the hundreds and thousands of bachelors and masters trained by pupils of the School of the Reformation? Am I wrong when I wish something of the same kind for this School of the Reformation? Let theology be the crown forever, as it was at Wittenberg, but let the thought of the founders of this school be fulfilled in the spirit of the School of the Reformation, the thought and purpose embodied in the very charter of Capital University, that it be a *university*, a home and mother of learning in all departments, and every one of them lit and guided by the Gospel.

Do we estimate the example and work of the teachers in the School of the Reformation at its true worth? Luther learned Greek and Hebrew after beginning his professorship — and he translated the Bible into German. Melanchthon was self-taught in both languages to a large degree, and he became one of the foremost Greek scholars of his day. German is forever indebted to Luther. With all our present wealth of assistance dare we remain behind? With the name of him who helped to make a language resting upon us and our schools, can we afford to slight and neglect that language? And shall the two languages which led to the very fountain whence all our progress has flowed,

be indifferently prized or inadequately taught in a school claiming the honor of being a School of the Reformation?

To graduate meant to take the master's degree in Wittenberg. How many *magistri* have we since the change made in '85?\* In fourteen years I believe only four. Is learning and mastery of knowledge so slightly esteemed by the pupils of this School of the Reformation? With all the progress made since the days of Wittenberg are our *studiosi* content with a modicum of learning, or are their abilities so mediocre that they cannot advance to compare with the *studiosi* of old? *Beatus est animal nesciens vitam studiosorum.* Will not some kind friend saw off the ox-horns, and cut off the long locks, and extract the hideous fangs, and pour over us the wine of a greater diligence and of a truer spirit of learning, that from the freshman on down to the oldest graduate we may be true sons of the School of the Reformation, *id est* lifelong *studiosi*?

---

\* Since '85 a dissertation is required for the degree of A. M.

---

## CRITICISM: TRUE AND FALSE.

TRANSLATED BY W. E. TRESSEL.

b) *The internal testimonies.* Only after this external investigation is ended does the critic enter into the book to be examined, in order to execute the "internal criticism." Here the question is: Does the book itself show signs, whether linguistic or material, from which it *clearly appears* that the book does not proceed from the time and from the author to which the external testimony points? Or does it, perhaps, on the other hand, exhibit signs, which point emphatically to the period indicated by the external evidence? And can the apparently contradictory signs be so interpreted as to be proved only *seemingly* so, and thus be brought into harmony with the undoubtedly positive signs? Apology is not bound to offer more than the *possibility* of another, namely positive, interpretation of such marks. If they *can* be understood otherwise than as the negative criticism understands them, then the latter is repulsed. For on the positive side will then also fall the mighty weight of the previously presented direct external testimony, which the opponent *lacks*. Even Wellhausen confesses, *Kompos*, p. 346: "If it (tradition) is even only *possible*, it would be folly to

prefer to it another possibility." An important concession. Now, however, the "internal criticism" must above all inquire about the *direct* mark of genuineness. This is the self-testimony of the book. This holds as the weightiest beside the direct external evidence. Only finally are the indirect internal evidences, the so-called *indicia*, introduced. The *indicia*-proof is always the *weakest* and *most uncertain*.

Dr. Blass says: "When Zeller formerly believed that he had proved, by 'internal reasons,' that Plato's laws (which are fully and certainly established by the evidence of Aristotle) were not genuine, one sees therefrom how *precarious* a foundation one has in these 'internal reasons.' There are means by which one can release himself from the strongest external testimonies, of course no legitimate means." In the domain of inner criticism the widest scope is afforded for the arbitrariness of the subject, for *his* explanation, *his* combinations, *his* "impression." The proof for this clearly appears in the contradictory conjectures of the critics. It is precisely the same in the sphere of profane philology among sceptical critics like Peerlkamp and Wolf. Cf. Madvig, *Opuscula Academica*, *Hanniae* 1887, p. 671 ff. Further proofs in my "*des Raetsels Loesung*," 2nd part, 2nd half (Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1896), p. 248-251.

If now the results of the external and the internal criticism agree in the direct testimony, and if the *indicia*, upon which the *indirect* internal proof is founded, *can* at least be interpreted in *harmony* with the other two, then according to the rules of sound profane criticism a complete and valid proof has been furnished, so that only the most extreme scepticism can yet doubt, on scientific grounds, the book's genuineness. This is the right and this the method of true sound criticism in the domain of profane as well as biblical criticism.

## II. MODERN FALSE CRITICISM AND ITS FALSE METHODS.

### 1. *The False Method of Historical Arbitrariness.*

If we measure modern criticism by the standard of "true criticism," we find it pursuing a method that can be proved to be false. First of all, it is the method of historical arbitrariness. For (a) modern criticism lacks all understanding of the importance of the historical foundation of tradition. It cannot take a step in its investigations without in fact placing itself on tradition. It takes its stand quite innocently on the codex that it has received from the past.



But it has no idea that the right thus claimed to stand on this basis involves far-reaching duties towards this complex of documents and that it retains the right thus claimed so long only as it fulfills these duties. This duty consists, first, in leaving, reverentially, the traditional foundation as it is, instead of arbitrarily changing it. Thus it is in the case of textual criticism; so also in reference to the contents. If we look, by way of illustration, into Wellhausen's "History of Israel and the Jewish People, 1894," what do we find? Pure arbitrariness toward the traditional contents of the Old Testament Scriptures. We may consider the statements of Wellhausen in this work all the more as his final results, since he here sums up his former investigations. In Ch. I Wellhausen says that the true home of the patriarchs was between Edom and Egypt. In amazement we inquire: From what secret archives has Wellhausen taken this piece of information? For in the documents of the Old Testament we find no trace of it. At his last assemblage of the people Joshua publicly declares (Josh. 24, 2-3): "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the river in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nachor; and they served other gods. And I took your father Abraham from the other side of the river, and led him throughout all the land of Canaan, and multiplied his seed." But Wellhausen knows much better than Joshua, a book that acknowledgedly bears all traces of the highest antiquity, and for whose credibility the Assyriological as well as Egyptian discoveries of today have proved to be of the highest corroborative importance.\* Whence has he this information? He has no answer. He, too, is confronted by the riddle, as to how these patriarchs found the God that was distinct from all the gods of other nations, which God, according to Wellhausen, Moses already found to be the God of these fathers. But Hosea, whose authority even Wellhausen recognizes, says that God spake at Bethel (with Jacob) Ch., 12, 4, 5. That is all real history for Hosea. Abraham and Jacob are historical personages for Hosea and Amos. The inscriptions, too, have recently furnished these names as those of persons' names. But for Wellhausen everything here is mysterious darkness. He has given the signal to his adherents for the most arbitrary *a priori* misconstruction of the primitive and prehistoric times of

---

\* Cf. Schrader, Keilinschriften, 2nd ed., 1883, p. 161; *Lex Moisaica* by French, 1894, IV. Period of Joshua. In addition, "Rätsels Lösung" by Eduard Rupprecht, 2nd pt., 1st half, p. 379 ff.

Israel from Fetishism on, a product of Hegel-batke religious scheme. Reuss takes a similar position. Israel's primitive history and prehistory are "saga and myth." Reuss takes up the tribes of Israel as they stand on the bank of the Jordan, ready to take possession of Canaan. In his view it was then yet a "barbarous people, a rude nomadic horde, "seeking for pasture and yet for spoil." Everything of patriarchal history previous to that does not exist for him as history.

And Moses? What does Wellhausen know about him? "Then help came to them through a man of God, Moses, whom the hour of need raised up." The "hour of need" raised him up! According to the Pentateuch God raised him up through self-revelation and command. A "man of God." For Wellhausen, who describes everything as occurring naturally, this is a phrase. Wellhausen then claims that the Hebrews, with wife and children and cattle, set out on their journey. That is all there is of it. Whence does he learn this remnant of information about which the documents only inform him, but which stands in connection with reasonably grounded occurrences that he despises? The Israelites, after a few days, come direct to Kadesh-Barnea, where they remain for many years. Again a shred, of which absolutely nothing would be known to him if he had not torn it out of rich documents which in other respects he casts aside. "In all probability they did not remain against their will in the desert of Kadesh. The desert was rather the goal which it was their immediate purpose to reach." Notwithstanding the "man of God," God does not, in Wellhausen's opinion, have anything to do with the affair. What appears probable to him is a work of his fancy. For a person who handles the documents in an entirely arbitrary way and for the most part rejects them has no historical sources. "Moses does not deserve the honor for the success of the undertaking, of which he was the soul. There was behind him one Higher, Whose spirit worked in him, Whose arm wrought in his behalf. It was Jahve." Generalizing dreamy reminiscences, for the detailed proof of which, i. e., the root of the whole, is cut off. It is like a few leaves of a plant that he tramples under foot, whilst preserving these leaves in his journal. What value does such a procedure have? It is arbitrariness. Who was this Jahve? Certainly not the Jahve of the Pentateuch. "Moses' authority, acquired by his previous deeds, naturally procured for him the office of judge of the people in

the wilderness." What deeds were these? "He helped the nation, he combined it into a unity by a religious confession." Empty generalities which say everything and nothing! "Moses connected the pronouncing of judgment with the sanctuary of Jahve, which was situated at the well of Kadesh." Where does Wellhausen, who despises the documents, get this latter fact? From these same despised documents. "Moses became to be the beginner of the Thora. Jahve became to be now, also, a God of righteousness and of justice." Was He not that before? Did Moses fabricate this notion and attach it to the idea of the deity? Wherein did this justice consist? Nobody knows excepting he who possesses the documents of that period. Wellhausen does not possess them. He constructs history for himself out of hazy reminiscences which he arbitrarily retains from the documents and extracts from the air in which his fancies soar.

"What Jehovah was in his own inner essence, nobody asked. The etymology of Jahve is perfectly transparent. He moves through the air. He blows as the wind. Jahve bears otherwise too a resemblance to Wodan." Of what value are such fantastic notions and imaginings? There are yet other imaginings from other critics opposed to these. Jehovah is called "the one who hews down," or the "one who breathes." That would be the one who gives life, or "He that calls into existence." The "destroyer." Who, now, is right, in claiming "transparent etymology?" Words, words! We hold rather to the documents that say, "I am that I am," i. e., the God who takes part in history, that exists and abides in Himself, the Absolute Unchangeable in the midst of the change and development of history.

The history of the settlement in Palestine is purely a product of imagination, the fruit of Wellhausen's inventive fancy. And yet he believes the book of Joshua so far as to admit that Joshua won a battle at Gibeon. Of course, a victorious battle must be introduced to make things interesting and exciting. But why is not everything here wholly invention? I see no reason why the poet should so slavishly subject himself to the historian at this point. This will suffice as a short series of illustrations to which, if the space of a systematic treatment did not forbid, we could add a number of parallels from Reuss to show that, according to Wellhausen, the older prophets, whom he must acknowledge in order not to stand wholly without foundation, were

altogether in error respecting the leading of Israel out of Egypt through the desert into Canaan; these prophets, however, are in full accord with the historical accounts of the Pentateuch. Thus Amos, 9, 7; Hosea 2, 15 (14); Hosea 11, 1. The older prophets also erred when they considered the God of those old Egyptian days as the true God. Their God is the same as the God of Moses' time. They do not first wake the God of Egyptian days to be the highest and then the only God. Wellhausen and his following know it all much better than do the historical documents, and if they are hard pressed by the prophets, then they know it much better also than those of the prophets whom they still accept.

What shall we say to this?

No man, not even the most highly gifted, knows the smallest thing of the past, if credible accounts from that period are not open to him. That is the a-b-c of historical reason. Even the hazy reminiscences, the general outlines which we find in Wellhausen, Reuss and their adherents, these men owe to the Biblical documents alone. But now, who gives them a right to make these meagre extracts from this documentary tradition and to reject the rest, from which they have made these excerpts? And what sure norm has guided them in their shadowy scheme, formations which make everything concrete disappear in the black of a self-made historical silhouette, as Hegel "of blessed memory" in his logical system of ideas presented a mere silhouette of the actual universe? Where is the right and where the standard for such a procedure? The critic takes his stand on the documentary history because without it he would have simply a "blank card." But instead of gratitude for this he demolishes the whole historical foundation excepting a few points, which he thinks will suffice to furnish standing ground, and then he constructs for himself history without history out of the vaporings of his own fancy.

Is that science? Is that scientific history? Consult the greatest historian, Ranke, and see how he treats the Bible history, the history of Israel, not to speak of the great John v. Müller. Look at Luden and Waebler, Schlosser and Leo, even Rotteck. Examine the method of the great Niebuhr, who claims for the Old Testament "unconditional truthfulness as well as the most accurate correctness among all historical sources" and brands the "rejection of the Old Testament books as an outrage, at least as very poor taste," and then compare with these, real historical inquirers of

the first rank, the position of a Wellhausen and company! On what side must the judgment according to right and righteousness fall?

Modern criticism is on the wrong path of historical arbitrariness. It is therefore a false criticism and is in the wrong.

## 2. *The False Literary Method of Subjectivism.*

"But whence this historical arbitrariness? That leads us to a second form of subjective arbitrariness. It is the false method of literary subjectivism."

The case is very clear. If the more moderate modern criticism would allow the five books of the Thora to pass as credible, authentic, documents, and from the time of Moses, then it would be under the scientific necessity of accepting as credible the historical facts therein narrated\* Whence comes the pretended right of modern criticism to emancipate itself so arbitrarily from history and to fabricate history according to subjective opinion? Solely from this that this criticism believes it has discovered as a "scientific result" that the documents which vouch for this history do not originate at the same time with the events thereunder, i. e. were not penned by Moses, but, as they now lie before us, are only the product of a more or less systematically arbitrary re-edition, intentional corruptions of a far later time, which have back of them a number of so-called original sources as a foundation, but that even the latter successively came into existence many centuries *after* the events therein related, on the foundation of a variegated oral tradition, and have themselves been worked over and worked together and finally, *at* or *after* Ezra's time underwent yet a last transformation at the hands of the "final editor," who himself, according to the singular theory of Klostermann, not only formally but also materially changed the account in a manner which Klostermann is not able to describe. And so it is really not possible for us to know any more what was in the "original documents." We hear *only the editors*, more accurately the *latest editor*, speak concerning Israel's history; and this editor did not have before him, in addi-

---

\*Only the naturalistic prejudice, antagonistic to miracles, a *dogmatic* principle, could, in an instance where the authorship had been proved to be of the time contemporaneous with the events, move the critic not to acknowledge the creditability of the historical presentation. In that case his criticism is controlled by dogma, not by historico-critical rules.

tion to the later writings, also the earlier documents, the so-called sources. And it can be proved incontestibly that these editors, whom criticism conjectures, could not have worked according to fixed principles, but that in an altogether unprincipled manner, they partly preserved with great pains, both as to contents and as to expression and choice of words, what they found, even to parallel repetitions of the same facts, and partly undertook subjective excisions, change in style, words and facts, which produced direct *contradictions* at times between the features of the text, by the *agreement* of which they nevertheless claim to recognize, in accordance with the critical principle, these various documents. Even Volck in "Entwicklungsgeschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion", although he still distinguishes between the sources, confesses that the ingenuity of the post-exilic final editor stands in flat contradiction to the ingenuity of the critics. On the one hand he very faithfully reproduces the sources; but then again makes changes. And Harper says: The editor omits and ignores, he changes and arranges; he treats the originals as freely as if he were their author. In this method of procedure consummate arbitrariness reveals itself. There is no system, and no sense. The editor is only the type of the critics themselves.

If the case really stands thus, then the right is granted to disavow the historical presentation of this editor as offered in the present Pentateuch as wholly overdrawn, arbitrarily falsified and fundamentally disfigured. Then modern criticism has with good right prepared the way to put instead of the arbitrary history of the editor another, namely the equally arbitrary record which is a dream of the critics' own fancy. But then the one is just as worthless as the other, so far as the reliable scientific knowledge of the history of old Israel, especially in its earliest beginnings, is concerned. On the one hand we have saga and myth combined with subjective repainting, on the other hand we have a critical dream of the 19th century professor. But even then the former would be preferable since the editor was in possession of some, though disfigured, sources, whilst the dreaming critic possesses nothing but his own ego, which presumes to master the editor after the lapse of twenty-five hundred years.

It will now be perfectly clear that modern criticism, in order to crowd out the documentary on the plea of falsification with its own subjective and invented history, must be wholly concerned about proving that the

documents as we have them (and especially the Pentateuch itself), which furnish the evidence for the history, are incredible, and not genuine. If criticism can do this, it has won: if not, it has lost. Wellhausen was so thoroughly convinced that this could be done, that he said: even if the traditional view were *possible* only, it would be foolish, to exchange it for another view (*Komposition*, p. 346). Let us apply this valuable and undoubtedly correct concession to the scientific documents.

And so the charge that modern criticism is on the wrong way of arbitrariness in its treatment of Israel's history is only then well-founded when we can further prove that modern criticism, both the radical, and the mediating following in the wake of the former, is greatly in error in the handling of the *literary* question and that it here becomes guilty of the same arbitrariness and contradictions as in the case of the historical question. In proceeding now to furnish this proof, we employ, for the sake of illustration, especially the "Introduction to the Old Testament" by Dr. Driver (translated into German in 1896, by Rothstein, Halle, and approved by the author).

What method does modern criticism pursue in order to investigate the Biblical writings, in this instance the Pentateuchal documents, as regards their credibility, genuineness? I shall not discuss the fact that modern criticism approaches the investigation with a fixed dogmatic prejudice, with the prejudice that wonders and prophecies in the full Biblical sense are impossible. The old-rationalistic criticism openly declares this. Berthold says that "unbelief is the basis of criticism." De Wette, "Einleitung in den Pentateuch", § 145 declares that "it is settled for the cultured intellect that such miracles could not possibly have occurred." Therefore a narrative recording miracles can *a priori* "not be contemporaneous with the event or be from contemporaneous sources." And according to Vatke, "sometimes the chief reasons for assigning a book to a later period are of a *dogmatic* nature." Vatke is known to be a Pantheist. And to this Pantheist the whole Wellhausen new-rationalistic school owes its religio-historical system which is its axiom and in harmony with which scheme it tears the Pentateuch into pieces and distributes these tatters among various periods while falsifying the contents.

This naturalistic presupposition is a subjectivism without any science and is incompatible with objective historical criticism.

But, as remarked, I will not emphasize this anti-historical, untenable dogmatic foundation of modern criticism, because it does *not* apply to false modern criticism throughout, but only to the extreme left wing, whilst the mediating investigators, like Strack, Koehig and Driver, to mention a few only, do not share this dogmatism of complete unbelief, but hold the possibility of miracles and prophecies. Driver is indeed reckoned by Dr. Zoeckler among the radicals, although among the more moderate of these. Similarly too is Dr. Kautzsch, who also is still a believer in revelation, and with whom Driver, in his German preface, p. 6 (footnote 1) expressly arrays himself. We shall yet return to this preface.

Apart from this unhistorical philosophical presupposition characteristic of the radical wing, the body of modern critics employs entirely the same method in order to test the Old Testament writings, especially the Pentateuch.

What method is this?

The first part of this treatise has already developed the sound critical rules which are energetically advocated by the profane philology of the present time over against the former inferior profane philological criticism of Wolf, Eichstaedt, Clude, Zimmermann, Bloch, Orelli, Ribbeck, Peerlkamp, Schoell. In defense of this genuine critical method there appear a Curtius, a Madvig, and above all a Dr. Blass, professor of classical philology at Halle, in his excellent and exhaustive treatise on "Criticism" in Dr. Iwan Mueller's "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" I. This method lies in the very nature of the subject, as was shown in our first part, and can never be despised with impunity. But this method is despised and totally ignored by modern theological criticism, long after profane-philological criticism has returned from false methods to natural sound critical principles. Above all, the *external* evidence of the literature following upon the time of the book in question is *entirely ignored*. None of the representatives of modern criticism consider it worth while carefully and methodically to consider the external testimonies, the importance of which in the sphere of the New Testament has been recognized anew in their clearness by Tiersch and has been advocated by him and by Tischendorf. And yet this external testimony of the later times is the least subject to subjective whim, and is the most objective and at the same time is unconditionally binding from a moral and scientific point of



view, *so soon* as its guidance is followed back to the threshold of the time which has been made the object to be investigated.

These modern critics indeed come to speak, in the development of their criticism, more or less concerning the literature of the following period. Driver discusses such testimonies as are produced by believing criticism for the existence of the P. C., e. g. in his examination of the "sources of the Hexateuch," pp. 154 ff., 157 ff. But his sceptical eye always detects a way of depreciating these testimonies.\* He nowhere gets beyond an "Indeed—but." This is also the case, in a less degree, with Strack and Koenig. Driver ventures, p. 134, footnote 1, the statement: "There is no passage in the Old Testament that ascribes to Moses, or even to Moses' time, the authorship of the Pentateuch."—"The Law of Moses is, of course, often spoken of, and it is unquestionable (why?) that the *beginnings* of the Israelitish law-giving extend back to him; but (!!) that expression is no proof that Moses was really the *author* of the *Pentateuch*, or even that the laws contained in the Pentateuch everywhere present his law-giving *unchanged*." That is a strong piece of scepticism, which, if applied to profane philology, would create a regular havoc in classical literature and in the domain of the New Testament would lead us back to Bruno Bauer. Even a Cornill is still a believer as compared with this. He still concedes that in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles the Pentateuch is without doubt traced back to Moses. So Kautzsch. As over against this radical scepticism of Driver's, read passages like Ezra 3, 2, "as it was written in the law of Moses the man of God". Or 6, 18, "as it is written in the book of Moses", or Neh. 8, 1; 13, 1, and then let one ask himself whether Driver's judgment, just referred to, does not surpass all the scepticism of the negative critics.

---

\* Where Driver believes that he has found external evidence *against* the Mosaic authorship, he also indulges at times in a little "external criticism." Thus he emphasizes Ezek. 44, 6-16 especially as "*most important testimony*" that P., in certain of its parts, is even later than Ezekiel. But he misunderstands the whole passage. a) It is not Ezekiel that here *gives directions* regarding the cultus, but God causes a *vision* to come upon him which in O. T. *symbol* produces before him the condition of the new congregation of the last times brought about by the Messiah; b) these are not directions for the *restoration congregation*; c) God would say 44, 6 ff.: In my future church shall only the "Zadokites," i. e. perfectly faithful, righteous servants approach unto me, not those of the old covenant, as the tribe of Levi, neither Levite nor priest as such. Here everything is a *figure* of the thought.

who, like Cornill and Kautzsch, at least yield that in the Ezra period the authorship of the Pentateuch is clearly attested by the literature. Or read 2 Chron. 17, 9; 23, 18, "written in the law of Moses". Here we are to bear in mind that the chronicler draws on *sources* named by him, which reach back to *David's time*. Read 2 Chron. 8, 12-13; 23, 18; 25, 4; 34, 14; 35, 6. 12. All *identical* expressions for the chronicler. 1 Chron. 6, 34 (49); 15, 15; 22, 12. 13 reach to David's time according to his sources. Read 1 Kings 2, 3; cf. 2 Kings 22 and 2 Chron. 24, simply as they read, not as the tendency-criticism, contrary to the text, has arranged them for its purposes, not to speak of the prophets. Read the book of Joshua, which even Assyriology recognizes as a *credible document* of the period immediately after Moses' period, aside from other reasons in favor of the book, above all read Josh. 1, 7. 8, evidence to which the testimony of the Ezra period for the *sepher hathora* or *thorat Moshe* firmly connects itself, without the discovery of a trace in the intervening books to indicate that at any time *between* Joshua and Ezra=Nehemia the conception of *sepher hathora*, which in Josh. 1, 7 is ascribed to Moses, had received another meaning or circumscription than it had in the mouth of God Josh. 1, 7. 8. Every such assertion of this kind is *arbitrariness* on the part of criticism which it must support by documentary reasons. That is a task which falls to *criticism* alone. Let a person read these few individual passages and then ask himself with what right Driver rids himself of the important and comprehensive first critical duty. the thorough advancement of the most important testimony, the most objective, the external, by carelessly flinging out the light, heartless footnote, p. 134 of his Introduction: "There is no passage in the Old Testament which ascribes the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses." Just so Robinson teaches. Here a deep physical disease, resulting from excessive scepticism is recognized, which makes the representatives of such criticism the objects not of moral indignation but of a deep pity. Even a Cornill and a Kautzsch do not dare to go so far with their assertions. We see that the modern rationalists, just as did those of sixty years ago, say with Bohlen: When in 1 Kings 2, 3; Hos. 8, 11. 12; Is. 17, 18 and similar passages (a few of which we selected above) the traditional standpoint finds a reference to a Thora book written by Moses, there is "nothing that binds us to understand thereby our Pentateuch."—"Who tells us

that such a book refers to a part of our Pentateuch, or the whole body of it?" Manifestly, in order to convince this Vatke-Bohlen and Driver critical school, it would be necessary that such a passage contain in parentheses the whole Pentateuch, or still better, to give exactly the number of the words and of the letters contained therein. In this way the "moral insanity" of this criticism destroys for us everything Mosaic, even the self-testimonies. This book of the covenant, this register of the stations, this Deuteronomy *might* have undergone a "revision." Yes, the undoubtedly genuine orations of Cicero, or Virgil, or Tacitus, *might* have undergone "revisions" in the "spirit and style" of these authors. Yes, what all might not happen! Who knows? When one approaches old documents with such a degree of scepticism, when one loses the moral conceptions *honesty* and *faith*, then one can doubt *everything*. Then the subject begins in his wild dreams the dance of fancy, and all the literature of the past sinks into dreadful—night. Driver carefully leads his pupils the first stages toward this abyss. And with him goes the whole modern criticism of Germany, whence he has received his inspiration.

---

## OLD TESTAMENT CHRONOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF THE MONUMENTS.

BY REV. G. FINKE, ASTORIA, ORE.

Chronology is an important part of history. But it is very difficult and partly impossible to give an exact and reliable chronology of the ages before Christ. The less certain results there are on any field of knowledge, the more hypotheses are brought forth. It is useless to produce here the mass of hypotheses about the ancient Hebrew chronology. All of them have no absolute reliable basis. And the old Hebrew chronology gives still more incomplete results than that of all other nations of antiquity. The ancient world knew no oneness of era. There is not one nation that counted the years from one certain event or year in succession. They counted the years from the beginning of the life or of the government of their kings or of other representative men or of important events. If we had all the names of the kings and their age and the correct succession of each and all and sure points at the beginning and end, we could

make something out of this. But our material is far from being complete. The oneness of era was of a comparatively late origin by some nations. Not until 300 B. C. did the Greeks count the year after the Olympian festivities which were celebrated every fourth year. The first Olympiad was—right or wrong—supposed to have been celebrated in 776 B. C. The Romans counted the years “*urbe condita*” (753 B. C.). But nobody knows with a certainty whether or not this was the year when Rome was built. Besides that Greek and Roman chronology could not throw much light on the ancient Hebrew chronology, because those nations did not have any connections with the Hebrews in the olden times.

When we affirmed above that the Hebrew chronology gives the most satisfactory results this is to be understood “relative.” Absolutely sure dates for single facts are not extant before the occupation of Babel by Cyrus (536 B. C.). For the period of the kings we have at least—this even the most radical critics admit—from Solomon downward an unbroken history in the Books of the Kings; although a unity of era is also not to be found there. Instead of this the author tells the history of Juda and Israel synchronously. This would be a great help in establishing a correct chronology, if we had only an absolute reliable starting point. Here the Assyriologists come to our help. A notice written during the time of Asurdan III. (772–754 B. C.), king of Assyria, was found; it says: “In the month of Sivan a solar eclipse happened.” Now astronomers have calculated that a total solar eclipse which was totally visible in Nineveh happened on the 15th day of June 763 B. C. This date was proved to be correct by a comparison with other inscriptions. It is evident that this date is of the highest importance, it is in fact the fundamental date of the ancient chronology. The year 722 B. C. is now acknowledged by all as the year of the beginning of Israel’s captivity in Assyria; and the year 586 B. C. as the year in which Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem. These dates agree fully with the statements of the Bible.

But the history of the period preceding the King’s Assyriology throws no light upon Hebrew chronology. It is true the ancient Babylonians were eminent astronomers; we find their traces still in our almanacs. Alexander the Great found (331 B. C.) in Babylon astronomical tablets which contained the unbroken observations and calculations of 1903 years, which therefore reached up to 2234 B. C.

This goes even further than the time which we usually accept as the time of Abraham. But the years are of no use if we cannot connect the events with them. The Bible helps us here by giving sometimes the sum of the years which passed since an important event. We will take the year 536 B. C. as a starting point; in this year Cyrus conquered Babylon and permitted the Jews to return to the Holy Land (Ezr. 1, 1). The Babylonian exile commenced 70 years ago, i. e. 606 B. C. According to the Bible the exile began 406 years after Solomon built the Temple. The Temple was built therefore in 1012 B. C. The exodus from Egypt took place 480 years before, i. e. 1492 B. C. (1 Kings 6, 1). But the accuracy of this chronology is doubted by some critics. If only the Egyptologists could help here! If they could name the Pharaoh of the exodus; whose name the Thora does not reveal, and make out the time when he lived. But the chronology of ancient Egypt is the poorest of all. Manetho's division into periods which he calls dynasties was made by him in the 3rd century B. C. and has no considerable value for the chronologist. From the remarks of Herodotus and Diodorus it seems that the 26th dynasty reigned from 664-525 B. C. But before that time everything is uncertain; there is no fixed point. In fixing certain dates for certain events the Egyptologists differ not only by years but by centuries.

But this state of affairs seems to be changed by the discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna letters. None of these 326 tablets which are covered with cuneiform inscriptions tells the time in which they are written. But the latter has been ascertained by the contents of the letters and by the names of the writers and addresses. Most of the letters contain calls for help, sent by the kings of Canaan to Pharaoh, their supreme lord. They make complaint against an enemy called "Chabiri" which name seems to be the same as ibrim (Hebrews). The "ch" cannot speak against this supposition, because we often find in the Amarna-tablets "ch" instead of ajin, e. g. Chezatifor 'Azza (gaza); Charos for Hazor etc. In some letters this enemy is given another name which the Assyriologists could not yet decipher.

Since the letters have different authors and are written in different states of the war, we do not expect in them a coherent description of the latter. It is however very significant that there are letters from Jerusalem (Urusalim), Lachisch, Askelon, Gaza, Japho, etc. For these are the cities which Joshua threatened or conquered in his south-

ern campaign (Joshua 10). The king of Jerusalem writes in one of his 7 letters to Pharaoh: "The entire land of Pharaoh is going to be lost and arises against me. The land Schiiri [Seir] to Ginti-Kirmil [Gath-Carmel], lost are the Kings" etc. The line from Seir to Gath-Carmel marks the land lost to the "Chabiri." Inside of this line the cities are situated which in Joshua ch. 10 are named. Of Joshua's northern campaign (ch. 11) also traces are found in the letters. Pharaoh learns by them that his cities in the land of Kedesh (Josh. 12, 22) and Ubi are in the hands of the enemy. Abimilki of Tyre writes that the kings of Sidon and Chasor have made a treaty with the enemy. At the gate of Zilu (Schilo) two kings are slain. It is important that there are two letters from Central-Canaan, for this part was in the beginning not threatened by Joshua. There is therefore much that speaks in favor of the supposition, that the letters treat the invasion of the Hebrews under Joshua. But who are the Pharaohs to whom the letters are addressed?

Pharaoh Nimmuria and his son Napchuria are named as addresses. Unhappily these named do not appear in the hieroglyphic inscriptions. But we find an important circumstance in the Tell-Amarna letters. There is a letter among them, written by Duschratta, king of Mitani, to Nimmuria in which he says: my father gave you my sister Kiluhipa in matrimony. In another letter the same is mentioned, besides that the name of the father is given, namely Schuttarna. In this and in other letters Tii is mentioned as the chief wife of Nimmuria and mother of Napchuria. Thus we have the name of the chief wife and that of one other wife of Pharaoh. Now the hieroglyphic inscriptions indeed tell of a Pharaoh who married Kirkipa, daughter of Satarna, king of Neharina, and who made Tii, daughter of Suaa and Tuaa, his chief wife. This Pharaoh is Amenophis III. There is no room for doubt any more that the Nimmuria of the cuneiform Tell-Amarna letters is the Amenophis III of the hieroglyphic inscriptions. Consequently we are to see in Napchuria, his son and successor, Amenophis IV. The change of his name Nimmuria into Amenophis (i. e., gift of Ammon) agrees fully with the character of the king, who claimed to be the natural son of god Ammon, as his pictures and inscriptions in the temple of Lugoore show. More arguments in favor of this hypothesis are given in my pamphlet, "*Das Schreien der Steine oder Hieroglyphen, Keilinschrift und Bibelwort.*"

Now the question arises: at what time did Amenophis III. and IV. who according to Manetho belonged to the 18th dynasty, reign? Although the hieroglyphics tells us much of the life of those kings, they do not give the least support for fixing only the century in which they lived. Calculations on the ground of the Bible show that the year of the Exodus is 1492 B. C. which is at the same time the year in which Amenophis III. died by drowning in the Red Sea and Amenophis IV. ascended the throne. Then the Hebrews began to conquer Canaan in 1452 B. C. The chronology of the Assyriologists seems to be in favor of our assumption. Among the Amarna tablets are letters of the Babylonian kings to the Pharaohs, namely of Kallima-Sin to Nimmuria and of Purnapurias to Napchuria, and one letter of Asurnadin-ache of Assyria to Napchuria. This shows that the respective writers and addressees were contemporaries.

When did these Babylonian and Assyrian kings live? Unhappily Babylonian history has here still a chasm, wherefore no absolute sure dates can be had. The famous Assyriologist Fred. Delitzsch calculated that Purnapuris—of whose predecessors Kallima-Sin was one—lived about 1440 B. C. This would come near to our affirmation, while his calculation "about 1420" for Asurnadin-ache is probably too late, even when the latter was young, and Amenophis IV. old when the letter in question was written. We may declare therefore on good grounds that the year 1492 as the year of the Exodus cannot be very far from the truth. Then a starting point is won also for the ancient Egyptian chronology. From this point other dates may be fixed forwards and backwards. The Egyptian chronology interests us only in so far as it is in contact with the Bible. Since the Israelites lived 430 years in Egypt Israel immigrated in 1922 B. C. This would bring us about into the time when the Hyksas who belong to the 15th and 16th dynasty, ruled in Egypt. After the Hyksas were driven out the legitimate kings ascended the throne again. This explains why the Hebrews were hated and feared when "a new king over Egypt arose up, which knew not Joseph."

## FUNERAL SERMON.

BY REV. M. R. WALTER, LOUDONVILLE, O.

THE CHRISTIAN'S CONSOLATION IN CONTEMPLATING  
DEATH AND THE JUDGMENT.

HEB. 9, 27. 28.

DEAR MOURNING FRIENDS:—Again have we assembled in the house of mourning. There is truly sorrow here, for God has called away the beloved wife, fond mother, dutiful daughter and kind neighbor into eternity. Yet, dear mourning friends, your grief is not as though this life were the end of her existence. You, too, know the admonition and the comfort which the Apostle Paul speaks unto us in his epistle to the Thessalonians: "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." Hence, even amidst tears and sorrow there is unspeakable joy for the Christian, because God is with him. The grave has a gloom and death has a sting, but not for the sons and the daughters of God. The coming judgment threatens horrors, but not to the followers of the cross of Christ. Strong in hope is the Christian's heart through the promise of Jesus. Instead of shrinking at the thought of death and the judgment, the Christian rejoices in the life and salvation through the merits of the Savior given as a gift of grace and in possession of all who believe on Jesus. This, my dear friends, is the Christian's consolation in contemplating death and the judgment, a comforting subject suggested by our text. In reviewing this theme may God in love and mercy grant us believing hearts as we consider :

I. *It is appointed unto men once to die.*

Death is the inevitable. It is the heritage of all people. None are exempt. None can resist it. None can bribe it to pass by. Nature has taught even the untutored savages of the forests that man is mortal. People of every creed under the heavens, as well as the infidels and atheists, all agree in this; man must die. How solemn sound the words of the Patriarch in the burial service. "Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth



like a flower, and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow and continueth not." Yes, this is the brief history of every human being. When death comes, our earthly career ceases forever. It may be that death ends the short history of the babe, or it permits the history to continue to youth, or, perchance, to middle age, while we all know that the old must die. Men of high estate, as well as those of the humbler classes, must die. The wealthy, as well as the pauper, is doomed by the same law of mortality. The Christian is not exempt. He, too, must pay that debt and meet his last foe. Death is the great leveler. Wealth and poverty, knowledge and ignorance, greatness and servitude shall vanish away.

"Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," was God's awful sentence pronounced upon Adam for sin -- and pronounced upon all who are born of the seed of Adam. That seed of death lurks in the veins of the newly-born babe. Day by day as it continues in this life, it is only rapidly going step by step toward the grave. Sin has made it, too, an heir of death. "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." All evidences are that man is mortal.

Life is short at the best. Every tick of the clock is, as it were, registering another death on the pages of eternity. That clock will soon record the end of our earthly life. Soon the grave will claim us all, for soon shall we be like unto the form lying in the casket. One by one as the autumn flowers fade and drop away, so, too, we lay to rest in the grave the friends of our youth, our manhood, and old age. Soon it will be that we will have more dear forms in God's acre than among the living.

"There is a Reaper whose name is Death,  
And, with his sickle keen  
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath  
And the flowers that grow between."

We shall soon fall beneath the sweep of the sickle. And then? Does death end our existence? Is it appointed unto men simply to die and then an eternity of unconsciousness? Are the few days we pass here all there is to man's existence? Is the grave the end? Ah—

"Life is real, and life is earnest,  
And the grave is not its goal;  
'Dust thou art, to dust returnest'  
Was not spoken of the soul."

Death is the separation of the soul from the body. The mortal remains return unto the earth from whence it was taken, but the soul, the spirit of man, returns unto God who gave it. The soul cannot die. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die," so also

II. *It is appointed unto men to be judged after death.*

Death itself is by the judgment of God as revealed unto us in His Word. Now, as true as that judgment takes place, so true, also, shall every one appear at God's judgment seat after death. As none can escape death, none can escape the all-searching eye of God. We shall all be summoned. Every one shall be judged according to the deeds done in the body. Every act performed, every word spoken, every thought entertained in the heart in the life here shall be revealed there. All secrets shall be revealed, and nothing remain hidden. No probation then, no reformation to be instituted there. No time of pardon and mercy then. Simply the verdict rendered according to the relation of the soul to God when it passed from time to eternity. Let us not forget; to be reckoned as children of God there, we must be the children of God here in time. The sentence then will be like the sentence God pronounces upon men while they live upon earth. God does not change. What He promises here, He fulfills there; what He threatens here, He will carry out there. His gracious promises and His stern condemnations He has caused to be revealed to us through the inspired writers in the Scriptures, as Christ's words are recorded by John. "He that believeth on Him (God's Son) is not condemned (not judged); but he that believeth not is condemned (judged) already; because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten son of God. And this is the condemnation (judgment) that light is come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."—O, God is so good, so merciful, so loving, that He has called unto all men to come to Him, that condemnation will pass them by. "Why, will ye die, O house of Israel," He calls unto us. But those who heed not the warning and are lost can only respond to the sentence: "Lost, lost because we loved darkness rather

than light and life." The day of grace and salvation is still beaming. Redemption is nigh unto every one of us. The kingdom of heaven with open portals invites the sinners to enter, and thus to pass from darkness into light, from condemnation unto life eternal by faith in our Redeemer's name. This gospel proclamation of free grace and salvation, heirship with Christ of the Heavenly Kingdom, is the foundation of

### III. *The Christian's consolation in contemplating death and the judgment.*

"Eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we die," is the argument of those who fear death and try to banish the thought of it from their minds. But pleasures and excitements of the world give no comfort. Wealth and honor and merry making smooth not the dying pillow nor ease the conscience from the pangs of doubts and fears and apprehensions what the future shall be. The knowledge, that we shall be held in affectionate remembrance by those dear ones we leave behind, who will bestrew our graves with flowers and mark the place where our bodies lie with a granite shaft, gives no comfort to the soul about to be issued into the awful eternity. Yet the masses pass away without hope of heaven. They live without Christ, and rely upon their own strength. But the works of men are too feeble and ineffectual to span that chasm which lies between earth and heaven. All the works of the combined human race would not redeem the least of sinners. "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Does the Christian trust in his own good life, or in his deeds of charity, or in his standing in the church, or in the prayers of the saints for his security to a title in the Father's House? Ask the dying Christian and he will tell you: "My only hope is Jesus, Jesus, only Jesus."

Every blessed saint now in heaven is there, because he had been saved alone by Christ.

The Christian, better than any one else, knows the weight of the burden of sin which hinders the way to heaven. The Christian knows that the perfection required by God to pass into the realms of bliss can not be attained by mortal man's effort. Christ alone is the foundation of salvation. He loved us and came down from His throne on high to live a life of perfection, which perfection is tendered us and which is ours when we believe. By Christ's righteousness we can stand before the judgment bar of God as

being holy, as we are wrapped in with the folds of that garment Christ wove by His life.

Christ also came to bear the sins of many, for He is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." He atoned for our sins by His bitter suffering and cruel death on the cross. He died that death to us might be but the step from earth to heaven.

This salvation, this joint heirship with Christ is offered us without money and without price; all ours by simply taking and possessing by faith.

Why has God made such a sacrifice for us? With our finite minds we cannot comprehend this stupendous grace, but let this suffice, that, "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And Jesus adds: "Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends." While Paul affirms: "But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." This is our comfort. Hence, the horrors of death and rigor of the judgment vanish when we are hidden in the wounds of Jesus. All our sins are crucified with Him. He arose from the tomb having conquered death and the grave. Now at God's right hand He makes intercessions for us by the merits of His life on earth and His death on the cross.

He has promised to come again to awaken the dead. Then shall He reunite our bodies and souls, and those who fell asleep in Jesus shall in the flesh see God. Those dear ones who have gone before, whose bodies we have laid to rest in God's Acre, they, too, shall live again in the body when Jesus comes again. We, too, who have lived and died in Christ, shall see them, and know them, and greet them, and with them we shall be forever more in presence of our God and our Redeemer, never, no never to part again. We believe, that our departed sister will be with the saints on that resurrection morn to live forever more in a glorified body in the eternal day of heaven, where Christ the Sun of righteousness shall be the light in that home in the Father's House, where He has gone before to prepare a place for them that love Him. Amen.

## AT THE FUNERAL OF AN ELDERLY GENTLEMAN.

BY REV. M. L. BAUM, DAYTON, OHIO.

TEXT: "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 15, 57.

*Hearers and especially mourning friends :*

Our hearts are sad to-day and surely it is not without a cause. A husband, a father, a brother, an uncle, one who was loved and honored by us all, has taken his final departure. He has bid farewell to this world with all of its pleasant and unpleasant associations, and has gone out into eternity whence no traveler returneth. He has gone and we have come, some of us from a distance, to show our last respects to his mortal remains by tenderly and sadly laying them in the silent grave, there to await the resurrection morn when all the dead shall hear the voice of the Lord and come forth. We indeed have a sad duty to perform, but in the providence of God it has come upon us; for death is nothing else than the Lord's call; by the grace of God may we be given strength sufficient properly to perform this duty. For three score and ten years the departed has sojourned here below; a good long journey this has been, much longer, no doubt, than many of us will be permitted to make, and yet the Lord has called him sooner than we were willing to see him go. It was the desire of our hearts that his life might be spared yet a while; but the Lord has desired and acted otherwise." The Lord's thoughts are not our thoughts, and the Lord's ways are not our ways." The old land-marks are, one by one, passing away. The ranks of our fathers of pioneer days are becoming very much depleted, not by desertion however, but by the one common slayer of mankind, known as death. Every instance of this kind is but another solemn reminder of the stern fact that all flesh is mortal; that we are all hastening onward toward the shores of eternity; that we here have no continuing city, but are seeking one which is to come. Do what we may, go where we will, we cannot escape death. It is sure to claim us as its victim, sooner or later. It is a debt which we all must pay. Facing such facts we should feel moved to prepare ourselves for eternity: to have our houses set in order so that at any time we might bid the Lord a hearty welcome. Every death in our midst should be an emphatic appeal for us so to

number our days that we might apply our hearts unto wisdom; unto such wisdom as begins with the *fear* and *love* of God. To die, being prepared by faith in Christ, is but to begin to live. To die in Christ is but to enter into a full possession of a great and glorious victory. While we tarry yet a little while before proceeding upon our way to the silent city of the dead, let me, upon the basis of this text, speak briefly of

#### THE VICTORY WE HAVE IN CHRIST.

##### I. *What is that victory?*

We can hardly speak of a victory without thinking of a combat or warfare. In this earthly tabernacle of ours we are in constant struggle with certain evil forces; forces that are warring against our temporal and eternal welfare. We are in open battle with sin and its many resultant evils. As a result of sin which came into the world through Adam's fall, we all have our labors and sorrows; our crosses and misfortunes. No one need to live as long as he, whose death we to-day mourn, to be convinced that life is a constant battle with evils and troubles of a thousand kinds. There is no life that is all peace and sunshine; days of gloom and clouds of darkness often come upon us. The few pleasures we have are overshadowed by the many cares that come upon us from without; and the bright hopes we have are often endangered by attacks from within.

And last of all we have to fight that one common enemy, known as death. We must sooner or later meet it, face to face. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned." But in Christ Jesus by faith we have a glorious victory over all of these evils and even over death itself. To die in Christ means to be delivered from all these labors and troubles which make life so burdensome. To die in Christ is to set at ease the soul which so often groans and sighs for relief. To die in Christ means a victory even over death and the grave. In Christ then we have nothing to lose and nothing to fear even though we see death approaching with its grim visage; nothing to dread even though we see the grave opening to receive our perishable bodies.

But the victory we have in Christ means not only a deliverance from all evils; it means more than that; it means

the coming into possession of something: the coming into the possession of a glorious reward—the crown of eternal life. It means to be ushered by the joyous hosts of heaven, into the kingdom of glory, and into the very presence of the living Redeemer, there to receive a crown that is incorruptible, a crown that fadeth not away. The victory which we have in Christ means eternal rest for the weary soul and endless happiness in the presence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and of all the saints and angels in glory. It means unspeakable joy in the kingdom where all of the troubles and unpleasant experiences of this world are unknown. One day's enjoyment of that victory would certainly more than repay us for all the sacrifices and efforts made for its acquirement. What a glorious victory we have in Christ!

## II. *How is that victory obtained?*

A victory is gained only by him who has been in the fight, by him who has had the tact and the strength to stand until the enemy has been put down; but the fruits of a victory may be enjoyed, even by those who were too weak to stand until a successful finish. So the victory of which we now speak; it comes to us not because of any merit or personal excellence on our part; for we are all by nature sinners; at our very best estate we are still very imperfect creatures; God's curse and condemnation rests upon every one of us. We have no moral excellence with which to plead our cause before God. Weighed in the balance we are all found wanting. Left to ourselves we would be eternally lost. Of our strength we never could hope to conquer the enemy and gain the glorious victory here spoken of. But thanks be to God; another one has gained the victory for us. Christ Jesus came into the world and put himself under the law, and by rendering perfect obedience unto it, has acquired for us a saving righteousness—a spotless robe in which if we are clothed no one shall be able to lay anything to our charge; a righteousness in which if we appear before the gates of heaven we shall be welcomed and ushered in amidst the shouts and the hallelujahs of the heavenly host.

But more than this; Christ has not only acquired for us a perfect righteousness by his obedience unto the divine law, but He has paid the penalty of our sins by His death upon the cross; He has made an atonement for all of our transgressions. He has satisfied divine justice, and thereby appeased the wrath of our grieved and offended Lord.

Christ our substitute suffered death; but death was not able to hold him in its grasp; for he broke the seals of the tomb and came forth unto a glorious victory, declaring thereby that He was the conqueror of death and of all the evil forces. The victory then was obtained solely and alone by Him who became our substitute; and yet that victory becomes ours not without some effort on our part. We appropriate His righteousness, His merits become ours only by our reaching out and taking hold of Him by the hand of faith; not a dead faith, but a faith that manifests itself in the godly, consecrated life of the individual; such faith as is wrought in our hearts by the Holy Ghost through the Word and Sacraments. God will even work that faith in our hearts, if we will only give Him the opportunity to do so, by our giving heed unto His means of grace. "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is a gift of God." "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God." Remember then this glorious victory does not depend upon what we are, or upon what we have done, but it depends entirely upon our acceptance of Christ Jesus our Savior. "He is the propitiation for our sins; but not for ours only, but for the sins of the world."

III. *Unto what should the knowledge of this victory move us?*

The knowledge of this victory should move us to rejoice in spirit in the time of the believer's death, even though we mourn in the flesh, as Jesus Himself did over the grave of His friend Lazarus. In this glorious hope there is much to cheer and to comfort us in the day of the Christian's death. In the death of one who has betaken himself to Christ, and washed himself in His precious blood, we need not sorrow as do those who have no hope. To die in Christ is but to begin to live, it means to come forth unto a glorious resurrection, and with those who are alive to be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so ever to be with the Lord. Oh how the knowledge of this victory should comfort us when one has fallen asleep in Jesus.

But we would be very ungrateful and unappreciative creatures if the knowledge of this victory did not move us to expressions of gratitude. We ought even to-day, under this heavy mantle of mourning, heartily thank God that He has placed such a victory within our reach. Thank Him that in His infinite goodness and mercy He has devised a plan whereby we poor sinladen creatures might be eter-



nally saved. Thank Him that He has so loved the world that He has given His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life. Thank God that He has opened up the doors of His kingdom of glory that whosoever will may enter in by Him who is the door.

Finally the knowledge of this glorious victory should move us to put forth every effort that it might eventually become ours. I am aware of the dangerous tendency and inclination of all people. I know that we are too apt to busy ourselves in looking after the comforts and welfare of our bodies, to the neglect of the higher interests of our immortal souls. Therefore I, in all earnestness, admonish you to take heed lest you become careless. Give attention unto the means of grace. Feed your souls regularly upon the bread of life. Cling to Him who is that Rock of Ages, cleft for us. Keep your spiritual houses set in order, so that at any time you may be ready to meet the Lord in death; for none of us knows how soon it may overtake us. To-day we may be well and hearty, but to-morrow may find us in eternity. Lay hold upon Christ and then if death comes we have nothing to lose, but a glorious victory to win. "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

I commend you, mourning friends, to God's loving care. May you be comforted in the promises of His Word. May He establish you in the saving faith and keep you steadfast until with all His people gone before, you enter upon the full enjoyment of that victory which you have in Christ. Amen.

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

---

Vol. XX.

JUNE, 1900.

No. 3.

---

## ELOCUTION FOR PREACHERS OR PUBLIC SPEAKING.

BY REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

In presenting this series of papers to my brethren in the ministry there is no desire or presumption to be their critic or teacher; but rather to be helpful in a practical and brotherly way, and to awaken interest in the subject and to magnify among us the office of the evangelical ambassador.

§ 1. The object. When reference is made to the object of these papers it is hoped a misunderstanding will not arise and the purpose be defeated. Reference is not had to the ultimate object of evangelical discourse, which is the glorification of the Trinity in the saving of souls; nor to the subject of persuasion which is intimately connected with the whole ministerial office; nor to delivery in its highest form as a work of art, as oratory in its best form is truly art: but reference is had to two things in particular, which should appear in pulpit work; they are the *comfort and health of the speaker* and the ability on the part of the hearers to understand what is spoken without strain and annoyance. The speaker should conserve his own energy as much as is in keeping with proper fervor, and it is his business and duty to give the truth forth in a form that will not tax the spirit of his audience to understand his words.

§ 2. The *need* of attention to these things, and the *opposition* to it, are both fairly summed up by a man who is at the head of the oratorical profession in the English language, and who is known well and favorably in two

Vol. XX. 9.

continents. Faithful consideration of his words may properly be asked.

"Elocution does not occupy the place it reasonably ought to fill in the curriculum of education. The causes of this neglect will be found to consist mainly of these two: the *subject is undervalued*, because it is misunderstood; and it is misunderstood because it is *unworthily represented* in the great majority of books which take its name on their title page; and, also by the *practice of too many of its teachers*, who make an idle display in recitation the chief, if not the only end, of their instruction.

"When we point to the fact, that public speaking is a part of the professional duty of every clergyman and advocate, and no unusual part of the social duty of a private citizen, and that public speaking involves two requirements, a knowledge of what to say and how to say it; and when we further advert to the fact, that in the whole course of school and college education, either for private citizens or public speakers, only one of these requirements is systematically provided for, the inadequacy of the provision to the requirements cannot but be manifest. We naturally ask, 'why is this'? The reason, perhaps, may simply be, that *so it is!* We are all slaves of custom, and cannot, without much difficulty, be brought to alter existing arrangements, however unreasonable. We are too apt lazily to acquiesce in things as they are, however wrong, and passively to accept the doctrine that 'whatever is, is right'.

"But besides this natural conservatism, this unreason, which is the principal cause of the maintenance of all error, there is another cause which is indeed a reason for the anomaly referred to, although the reason itself will be admitted to be unreasonable: a prejudice exists against the cultivation of *manner* in delivery. Prejudice,—that reason's very opposite,—denounces manner as if it was a thing of no *matter*. 'Manner' and 'matter' are spoken of as antagonists in oratory. But what is matter without manner? Matter is the native unquarried rock; manner is the chiseled statue, or the sculptured palace. Matter is the chaos 'without form and void' when 'darkness brooded over the face of the earth'; manner is the rolling globe launched in the flood of light, and beautified with hill and dale, ocean and streamlet, herb, and tree, and flower. Manner is the manifestation of all matter; and no matter can be known but by the manner of its presentment.

"This is equally true of intellectual as of physical material. The matter of the finest oratory may lie hidden within the brain, worthless and unappreciated; as the marble of that sweetest creation of the sculptor—the 'Greek Slave'—lay buried in its native hill, till Powers arose that could unveil its symmetry and grace. And it depends entirely on the speaker's skill,—his power over manner—whether he fashion his matter into a paving stone or a Medicean Venus.

"But this prejudice has a moral root from which it derives all its vitality: 'The eloquence that fascinates may be employed to dazzle and seduce. It may be used to make the worse appear the better reason.' True, but the greater the attractiveness of eloquence for purposes of mere amusement, or for more unholy ends, the stronger is the reason and the more imperative the duty to master its refinements, and utilize its influence in all good and sacred causes.

"The adage cannot be too often repeated that whatever is worth doing at all, is worth doing well; and we may add, the worthier any object of effort, the higher should be the standard of execution. Slovenliness is intolerable in the meanest business. How much more so in the highest, and especially in that which has an aim beyond all earthly objects!

"But by whom is this prejudice entertained? Who are they that shake the head at oratorical refinement in the pulpit, and denounce preparatory study of 'manner' as 'theatrical'? Are they the eloquent of the Church, the ornaments of their profession, speakers refined by culture, or endowed with natural powers of eloquence? No! They are those only who are themselves destitute of any pretensions to effectiveness. No man who is conscious of the ability to speak effectively can undervalue the power, and none who is not competent in this respect, can judge of its value or pronounce it worthless.

"The study of oratory is, however, hindred by another prejudice, founded—too justly—on the ordinary methods and results of elocutionary teaching, the methods being unphilosophical and trivial, and their result not an improved manner, but an induced mannerism. The principle of instruction to which elocution owes its meanness of reputation may be expressed in one word,—imitation. The teacher presents his pupils with a model or specimen of

reading or declamation, and calls on them to stand forth and do likewise. The model may be good, bad, or indifferent, it is, at all events, tinged with the teacher's own peculiarities, and the pupils, in their imitative essays, can hardly be expected to distinguish between these accidents of style and the essentials of good delivery which may be embodied in the model. Thus, becoming accustomed to imitate the former, they naturally confound them with the latter. Each pupil, too, has his own peculiarities, already more or less developed—arising from structural differences in the organs of speech, from temperament, or from habit,—the result of previous training or of previous neglect. These fixed idiosyncrasies and tendencies, mingled with the imitated peculiarities, form a compound style, which, whatever its qualities, can hardly fail to be unnatural. Besides, as imitation is in a great degree an unconscious act, habits are thus formed of the existence of which the subject of them is entirely ignorant. In no other way can we account for those monstrous perversions of style which are so common, and so patent to all but, apparently, the speakers themselves. The very purpose of a philosophical system of instruction should be—to give us a standard by which to measure our own shortcomings and, primarily, by which we can discover them.” — [The Principles of Elocution by Alexander Melville Bell. Introductory Essay.]

If anything more be needed to set forth the demands in this connection let a few facts suffice. Take six months or a year for a limited observation. Notice the ministry on platform, in pulpit and at conferences. They do not stand easily and even politely; faces are distorted, one shoulder elevated, hip out of place, head awry, the tone often too high in pitch, blurred by aspiration, colored by nasality and other serious defects, while the possessor is in blissful ignorance of it all, and will even deny the possession of any of them. The writer recognizes that he has his share of them, and only wishes that in his early life such direction had been given to his delivery as would have enabled him to talk easily and directly to his audience. And yet there is no cause for discouragement. After some years of observation it can be said that the ministry of our Synod compares favorably with other bodies of men, whether ministers or teachers of the art of elocution itself. For the good of the speaker himself, for the welfare of the people to whom he administers and for the glory of the

cause in which we are all engaged, every possible effort should be put forth to make our office truly effective.

§ 3. The plan to be followed contemplates the treatment of those topics which are most essential to the natural, easy and forcible presentation of the speaker's thoughts. The college and seminary are supposed to furnish the matter, and we have to do with the manner, which deals particularly with the man and his speaking. It may be desirable also in the course of the discussion to give some rules and examples in the analysis of thought. It has been frequently observed that in Bible and hymn reading there is a great lack in the comprehension of the thought, and emphasis has been so misplaced as to reveal the fact that some primary principles of analysis of thought and of inflection have never been grasped, though they are contained in the natural expression of such thought. Much of this comes from the want of attention to the utterance of thought and to the mistaken notion that intonation and proper enunciation and appropriate inflection have little or nothing to do with the meaning conveyed in the words. No more serious mistake can be made by the public speaker. His aim should be to utter his matter in a way never to call attention to the manner; but to claim and hold the attention of the hearer to the matter only. He has then arrived at that point in his work which exalts his calling; he can conceal his methods of art, and that is the true art.

#### CORRECT STANDING POSITION.

§4. The speaker must be upon his feet; and whether in pulpit with or without clerical robe, or on platform, there is a vast difference in the way in which he stands. It has to do with his health, his message and his audience. If he obtains proper poise and equilibrium it will assist him in all the activities of life. Walking will be easier, breathing can become what it ought to be, and the whole man will appear just what he is, the noblest work of God. For the purpose of explanation we will call man a trinity. He has head, and trunk and limbs; and each part as well as sub-part has its trinity, as any one can observe in arm or leg. This is not the place to explain the different meanings in the attitude of the body; but attention is called to the fact that there is meaning in attitude and the speaker's business is to have

that position which accords with his calling and thought and the proprieties of life. What impression it makes on an audience for a vigorous and healthy man to stand on platform with feet twelve to eighteen inches apart and weight equally on both feet, and on the heels at that! How the audience titters or sympathizes with the speaker when he lacks poise, playing teeter with himself by transferring the weight from foot to foot without reason or grace. Look at that man, you will at times hear; he does not know what to do with hands or feet. It inspires an audience to see a good presence and to have the speaker at ease and master of the situation. In order to acquire such presence a few general principles will be of great service. The facts given here are as important for all members of the family as for the speaker or man himself.

Principle: The chest is the seat of life, and if held in right position will add vigor and good presence to the individual.

It is easier to state this truth than it is to make it a part of one's daily life. But we wish to impress it upon the reader. Most people permit the chest to sink down until the lungs are not given proper room and press upon the diaphragm, and that upon the stomach, and it upon other parts, and thus the whole vital organs of the body are lower than they should be. If the chest is put into its proper position and held there, the other vital organs will take their proper places and the muscles that control and invigorate them can perform their proper functions. The system will put on new life and the presence of the person will be more commanding.

Principle: The law of opposition must be observed in order to secure true and correct poise and to make effective the chest position.

Oppositions may be of attitude or of action. The observance of them will lead to grace and the want of them shows uncouthness or awkwardness. The oppositions of movement are easily seen and recognized. As the right foot is advanced in walking the left hand will advance also, while the right hand will go in an opposite direction to the foot. When the hand is raised the head inclines toward it; when the arm moves toward the right the head moves toward the left, and vice versa. These movements will be more fully explained in another place. We want here to see the opposition in attitude or standing.

Correct standing for good and effective speech never sustains the weight equally on both feet for any length of time. It may be and is a good position to take for practice so as to obtain control of self, but it deprives the person of freedom of action and generally induces an incorrect chest position, if used much in discourse. The weight is usually on one foot chiefly; and that necessitates the observance of the law of opposition both for ease and grace.

*The weight must be on the ball of the foot or on the balls of the feet.*

Let this become a maxim and a settled habit. That will help in obtaining and retaining a correct chest position, just as the correct chest position will lead to the weight being placed on the balls of the feet. With the weight on the ball of the left foot, the right foot resting from four to six inches in advance with the back of the heel pointing toward the instep of the left, each foot pointing out at an angle of 30 degrees from a straight line upon which the inner corner of the left heel and the back part of the right heel is standing, take an easy and firm position. The left hip will go out to the left while the shoulders will incline to the right, and the head will incline a little to the left, and thereby the law of opposition in attitude is observed. Put the weight on the right foot with left in advance, and the right hip will move out to right, shoulders to left and head to right. Thus the law of opposition is seen.

Mere information on these things is not sufficient. No one really knows them aright until he does them and no one can do them as it should be until he does them without the need of attention to them. He must make them a habit.

#### § 5. Exercises to obtain correct attitude in standing.

1. Exercise for chest position. Put the weight of the body upon the balls of the feet, the toes pointing outward and describing an angle of about sixty degrees, and heels nearly touching each other. Place the arms in front at an angle of about forty-five degrees with the body, then push with the hands in the direction indicated by the arms, and at the same time push up and back the crown of the head. Hold head and torso in the position secured by this exercise, and let the arms drop easily at the sides.

The frequent practice of this exercise will bring the head and neck into line with the spinal column, and the



chest will be lifted into proper position for health and all voice work.

2. Exercises to secure poise. Take the position acquired by the above exercise, with arms at sides, and with the chest leading, poise the body as far forward as possible (without losing equilibrium), then as far backward as possible, maintaining throughout the entire exercise the same angle between the chest and floor as in the standing position.

Take first position again, rise on toes, descend to position, touching heels lightly on the floor, rise again and hold while counting four, then descend slowly to first position.

Now take the weight upon the ball of left foot, heel lightly resting on the floor. Swing the right foot in a way to describe a circle around the left, then back, not allowing it to touch the floor, and, finally, holding it behind the strong foot, poise the body forward, backward, to position.

Transfer the weight to the other foot and repeat the exercise.

The value of these two exercises cannot well be over-estimated. All the organs in the body are lifted to their proper position. Each part in the person is so lifted up from every other part that it has freedom to act in its own sphere. The head does not burden the neck, the neck does not oppress the chest, the chest does not oppress the viscera, the viscera does not weigh on the hips, and the hips do not strain the knees for support, and the knees do not put over-exertion on the ankles.

These exercises are adapted from Emerson's *Physical Culture*, and have been found by practice to produce most excellent results.

§ 6. Correct standing position. Every standing position of grace has a single base for support. The feet may be called a four legged support; the four supports are the balls and heels of the feet. It is common and coarse, and marks inferiority, to stand on the heels, or both balls, or all four at the same time. The use of both feet for support puts the speaker in a poor position. He cannot move or change his attitude until the weight is transferred to one. The feet should be separated in the lengths and not in breadths, except in old age or weakness. There are four oratorical positions. It is well to learn them and practice them until you habitually stand in them. For convenience we number them.

1. Weight on left foot retired. Right foot is in advance as described in § 4, and no weight upon it except its own, and knee slightly bent.

2. Advance the weight onto the right foot while standing in number one; the toe of the left foot will touch the floor, and heel will be slightly raised. The right foot is advanced and weight upon it. This is the position of animated discourse.

3. The weight is upon the right foot retired, the left is slightly in advance and carries no weight.

4. The weight is on the left foot advanced, and corresponds with number two as number three corresponds with number one.

The practice of standing in these positions and moving from one to the other, and walking with the chest carried as obtained in the preceding exercises, will enable the preacher to quit himself like a man and conserve his own energy, while using all he needs for his work.

---

## THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,  
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### A. *Exhortation to Obey the Government:* Vv. 1-7.

The history of the Church shows that not so very rarely the idea has been expressed that the allegiance a Christian owes to his heavenly Lord and Master does not tolerate submission to a secular ruler. Christians of Jewish origin were especially tempted to give their assent to such a view, since their people during their best times had enjoyed a theocratic government, that is, a government where God Himself is the law-giver, the secular government being simply His instrument and servant in carrying out His laws and ordinances (comp. Matt. 22, 17sq.). And this temptation must have been the greater when the secular ruler was a moral monster and a tyrant of the most cruel disposition, as was the case with the Roman emperor then.

on the throne, Nero (A. D. 54-68). Therefore St. Paul here, in his epistle to the Christians at Rome, the capital of the emperor, laid down the fundamental principles with regard to the attitude of a Christian toward civil government. Every individual without any exception is to subject himself to authorities that have power over him, and thus by his conduct to recognize the existing state of affairs. Authority and government in general exists only because God has ordained it; and those governments that actually are in existence owe this to the ordinance of God. For God wants order among men, and hence it is His will that there shall be some kind of government, though He has not prescribed a special form, monarchy, or aristocracy, or democracy. Even if a government should not have come into existence in a legal, commendable, and God-pleasing way, as most of the existing governments very likely have not, whenever and as long as it undoubtedly is in possession of the power to rule and exercises this power, we must submit to it, not sanctioning thereby the unrighteousness of men, but honoring the will and ordinance of God. A government that neither in its origin nor in its conduct is what it ought to be is far preferable to no government or anarchy, and it is the will of God that we submit to it and obey it as long as it does not ask us to act contrary to an express commandment of God (comp. Acts 5, 29). Of course, the question when a government is to be regarded as actually existing and hence to be recognized and obeyed, may in some cases be difficult to decide; but such cases of casuistry cannot be covered by a general rule and must be left to the sober judgment of a conscientious Christian (1). In accordance with the principle just laid down who-

---

V. 1. "Every soul": emphatic for *every man or person*; comp. 2, 9; 1 Pet. 3, 20. There is no exception to this rule. ὑποτασσέσθω (middle voice, imper. pres.): let it (continually, as a habit) subject itself (willingly, not because forced). "To authorities (powers) existing above it (having supremacy)." As representatives of God, instruments of His government, by virtue of their office, they are superior to their subjects, whatever their character otherwise may be. The absence of the article emphasizes this quality. Comp. 1 Pet. 2, 13. "For there does not exist an authority except of God" (except it be in existence by God: ἐπὶ θεοῦ). "And the existing ones have been ordained (established, appointed) by God" (the last two words being emphatic: the arrangement and institution is divine, not human, whatever of human imperfection or even wicked-

ever sets himself against the existing government, whatever its form or condition may be, stands in rebellious opposition to the ordinance of God and can only expect to be punished for it by the government as the executor of the will and judgment of God (2). For that is the very office of the government to punish evil deeds, such as the resistance to divinely-ordained authority, whilst it is to favor and protect those that do what is good (3). Hence every citizen that does his duty has a right to expect the government as the minister of God to do him good; but if he does not do his duty he has to fear its wrath and punishment, which may consist, and in one case, wilful murder (Gen. 9, 6; Matt. 26, 52), ought to consist, in

ness may cling to the incumbent of the office). The office here evidently includes the persons that fill it: as long as they do so they must be recognized and obeyed.

V. 2. "He that resisteth": ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος — the very opposite of subjecting oneself: ὑποτάσσεσθαι, including every kind of disobedience. "The authority (power)": the one to which he is subject. "The ordinance of God": that makes his sin so grievous, his being a rebel not simply against men but against God. "To themselves": emphatic, dativus incommodi; their resistance and disobedience only brings them danger and harm (comp. 2, 5; 1 Cor. 11, 29). "Judgment": in the evil sense of the term, condemnatory and punitive (comp. 2, 2 sq.; 3, 8; 1 Cor. 11, 29). Who as a rule is to pass and execute that judgment is seen from the next verse, though, in case of non-repentance, eternal punishment is not to be excluded, as are also not temporal visitations of God.

V. 3. Οἱ ἄρχοντες: the rulers, or, those that rule (the word is originally a participle but is frequently used as a noun). "A terror" = a cause of terror, to be feared (metonymy). "Not to the good work, but to the evil": subjecting oneself to the government belongs to the class of good, useful works, resisting it to that of evil, bad works. The two kinds of work are personified. "But dost thou wish not to fear the authority?": this sentence in the original may just as well be understood as an affirmative one containing a condition = "But thou wishest not to fear": I suppose that is the case. Then "do that which is good." The latter sense is more emphatic (comp. 1 Cor. 7, 18). "Do": habitually (ποιεῖ imper. pres.). "And thou wilt have praise from it", i. e., from the authority or government: the consequence will be that thou art recognized and treated as a good, dutiful citizen. Ἐξ denotes the source of the praise. The government has to do with "works", not with the condition of the heart which is subject solely to God. The attitude of the government described here is the ideal, normal.

taking the life of the dangerous, incorrigible subject. For the government, as the minister and representative of God in secular matters, has even the power of life and death, symbolized from olden times by the sword either borne by the rulers themselves, or carried before them by their servants. For God wants the government to manifest its anger to evil-doers by punishing them according to their deserts (4). Hence there is a necessity of being submissive to the government, and this already because in case of disobedience the government may be expected to manifest its righteous anger in punishment; but a Christian ought to be obedient mainly because it would be against his conscience to oppose an ordinance of God (5). A manifestation and proof of this moral necessity of obedience is also the paying of taxes on the part of the citizens (comp. Matt. 22, 29). For the persons constituting the government are public servants of God, serving not only God but also the community, and cannot perform the duties of their office without the payment of taxes on the part of their subjects. Hence they must continually pay attention also to this very thing without which the machinery of government would soon

---

V. 4. "For God's minister it is", and therefore is intended in the first place to do good, not to punish (*διδάσκων* here feminine, referring to *ἐξουσία*). "To thee" (dat. comm.): in thy service; "for that which is good": useful to thee. *Ἐὰν ποιῇς*: if thou do — a supposition referring to the future, suggesting some probability, at least possibility, of its fulfilment, because of the sin that clings to the best of Christians. "Be afraid": fear, namely, the government. "Beareth": *φορεῖ* (continually, as a symbol of its power, not *φέρει*: carrieth). "For God's minister it is avenging unto anger (so as to show and manifest its anger) to him that practiseth that which is evil (bad, wicked)." The government in its divine idea is the guardian also of external morality, but not of religion and piety, since that is a matter of the heart. The government being God's minister and representative, its anger and God's anger, namely, on account of evil works, ought to be identical, and normally is.

V. 5. *Διό* = *διὰ ὃ*: on which account, therefore; it refers to what so far has been stated, especially, however, to verses 3 and 4 which speak of the moral character of government according to which its authority is not simply based on power and fear. Hence moral necessity is emphasized here, as being a necessity "not only on account of the anger (of the government) but also on account of the conscience (of the Christian subject)": *οὐ μόνον . . . συνείδησιν* is to be construed with *ἀνάγκη*, not with *ὑποτάσσεσθαι*.

come to a standstill (6). So then a Christian should do his duty towards all his superiors, rendering to every one what he has a right to demand, whether it be taxes or duties for the support of the government, or reverential fear because of power and authority, or honor and respect on account of position and dignity (7).

B. *Exhortation to Perform all our Duties towards our Fellow-men in true Love:* Vv. 8-10.

V. 6. "For on this account you also pay tribute (taxes)": because you know that there is a moral obligation of obeying the government and making it possible for it to perform its divinely-appointed office. The habit of paying taxes (τελείτε indic., not imper., pres.) is regarded as a proof and manifestation of that consciousness. Others refer this verse to verses 1-4, coordinating διὰ τοῦτο with διό in verse 5 and regarding as the cause and motive meant here the purpose of the government described in verses 1-4, viz., to be the minister of God appointed for the benefit of men, which purpose cannot be attained without getting by taxation the means of carrying on its work. The former construction, however, is the more natural. Λειτουργοί says more than διάκονοι: the latter are all persons that are active in the service and for the benefit of others (comp. John 2, 5. 9); the former have a public office, serve the community, like the priests of the Old Testament (comp. 15, 16; Phil. 2, 17). The subject of this predicate must be supplied from the context: οἱ ἄρχοντες (verse 3). These rulers serve God in a public office, and hence must continually pay attention to everything that is connected with this office and necessary to perform its duties, hence also, and as a main thing, to the collecting of taxes. He that by virtue of his office serves the community has the right and duty to demand of the community the support necessary for the performance of his office.

V. 7. "Render": pay off, discharge what is due (ἀπόδοτε). "To all": in this connection evidently refers to persons that are our superiors, as can also be seen from the demands made in this verse. The next verse, and not this one, begins a new section. "Their dues": what you owe them. After the dative together with the first accusative (τῷ τὸν φόρον, τῷ τὸ τέλος, etc.) the expression ἀποδιδόναι κελεύοντι = ἀπαιτοῦντι is to be supplied; after the second accusative (τὸν φόρον, τὸ τέλος, etc.) ἀπόδοτε; so that the completed sentence would read: "To him that (by virtue of his office) demands the taxes (due him), pay the taxes; to him that demands the custom, pay the custom, etc." Τέλος is excise or duty levied on goods exported or imported: custom.

A Christian, yea, every man of character and honor, ought to have no debts whatever, if he can in any way help it, but to pay everything he owes, so that nobody can have any just claim on him in this respect. But there is one debt that rests upon every man which we can never fully pay so that we did no more owe it; and that is love to each other, a debt that is ever new and binding, demanding payment every day and hour of our life. For love of our neighbor is the fulfilment of the Law in so far as it refers to our relation to our fellow-men, since love is that state of mind and heart that shirks from doing evil to any one; and the Law as the expression of the will of God we must always fulfill; we can never say that we have done with it. Hence we can never say that we are no more under the obligation to love each other (8-10).

V. 8. Ὁφείλετε must be imperative because of the subjective negative (μηδενὶ μηδέν); and this also best fits in the context. Τὸν ἑτερον: the other = our fellow-man, neighbor (comp. 2, 1. 21). It is not to be construed with νόμον which word even without the article can denote *the* (divine) Law since there is only one and the expression may be viewed as a proper noun (comp. 3, 20; 5, 20); or we may with *Weiss* understand it of any law: there is not, and cannot be, any law that requires more. We prefer the former. "Hath fulfilled the law": our duty is always to be in a condition to say, We have fulfilled the Law; and if loving our fellow-man is identical with having fulfilled the Law, we must love him always.

V. 9. Τὸ makes the four commandments that follow one noun, and this composite noun, together with the sentence, "And if there be any other commandment," is the subject of ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται: "is summed up." In the same way τῷ makes the sentence ἀγαπήσεις κτλ. a noun dependent on ἐν. We can, in a somewhat free way, translate in both cases: this (commandment). The order followed here, placing the sixth commandment before the fifth, we find also Mark 10, 19; Luke 18, 20 (comp. James 2, 11), but not Matt. 19, 18. This may be owing to the Septuagint translation which in some copies has this order whilst others have the usual one. It shows, at any rate, that not the order and counting, but the observance of the ten commandments is the main thing. "If there be any other commandment" (= whatever other commandment there may be), having different contents, forbidding or commanding something different (ἑτέρα), for example the fourth and eighth. "In this word it is summed up, in this (word or commandment)." Comp. Lev. 19, 18; Matt. 22, 39 sq.; Gal. 5, 14. The indicative of the future (ἀγαπήσεις), in prohibitory commandments preceded by οὐ (οὐ μοιχεύσεις, etc.), is also by classical writers used instead

C. Exhortation to Walk in the Light: Vv. 11-14.

As a special reason and motive for giving heed to his admonitions the Apostle mentions the knowledge that his readers have as to the character of the time in which they live; namely, that it is such a time that they ought now at last to awaken and arise from the sleep of sin that more or less clings to every Christian; for every day since they have come to believe in Christ has brought them nearer to the last day and the full realization and enjoyment of their salvation in the world to come (11). The night of this world full of sin and misery has come nearer to its close, and the day of eternal life and happiness begins to dawn..

of the imperative, expressing the positive expectation that something will be done or not done. *Τὸν πλησίον* = *τὸν ἑτερον*: thy neighbor, fellow-man (comp. next verse). "As thyself": self-love, appreciating oneself as the creature and child of God, is right; but not selfishness.

V. 10. *Τῷ πλησίον* scil. *ὅντι* (πλ. is an adverb): to him that is near (to a person). "Does not work ill (what is evil or bad)", or, to preserve the order of words, "ill it does not work", omits working it; hence it observes the commandments cited. "Fulfilment. consequently, of the Law" (comp. verse 8) "is love." *Πλήρωμα* is not the act of fulfilling (*πλήρωσις*), but the fulfilment "as an accomplished fact" (*Boise*).

V. 11. "And this", viz., do. To make *τοῦτο* dependent on *ἐλδοτες* and regarding *τὸν καιρόν* as an explanatory apposition would leave the sentence incomplete, to be taken up and completed by *ἀποθώμεθα* κτλ. in the next verse; for the *οὖν* prevents this latter clause to be connected with the first sentence of verse 11, so that what is between the two (*νῦν . . . ἡγγικεν*) would be considered as parenthetical. Moreover, either *τοῦτο* or *τὸν καιρόν* would be superfluous. *Ἡδὲ* is best construed with what follows: that now at last, waiting no longer. *Καίρον* is "the critical nick of time" (*Trench*), the time in which something can and should be done; such was that time. *Ὡρα* is a definite, proper, right time. *Ὁτι ὥρα* κτλ. explains *τὸν καιρόν*. That Paul does not mean to administer here any special rebuke is evident if the reading of some good manuscripts is the genuine one, viz., *ἡμᾶς* instead of *ὁμᾶς*, which would include Paul; but also the "night" spoken of in the next verse, which figure corresponds to that of "sleep" in the present verse, shows that the latter expression does not refer merely to the condition of unconverted men, but rather to that of Christians. (comp. the whole next verse). "For now" (at this present time):



Hence it is meet and proper that we should divest ourselves of the works and practices that are characteristic of darkness and sin, and put on the armor that belongs to light and holiness and is needed in the fight against darkness and sin, that is, by the grace and power of God more and more make our own a heavenly mind and life (12; comp. John 8, 12). As the day of deliverance from sin and all misery is nearing, we should already now lead a life that is in accordance with that day and becoming a child of God, and therefore avoid the vices in which the children of this sinful world delight, especially gross sins against the sixth and fifth commandments, which, as experience proves, generate one another and love the darkness of night (13).

this sentence explains and proves the preceding one. Ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν belongs together: "nearer to us"; to construe the latter word with what follows ("our salvation") would give it an undue emphasis, as in that case it would occupy the first place. Ἐτίστεύσαμεν: the ingressive or inceptive aorist: began to believe, attained to faith. "Salvation": here in its perfect form which it does not reach here on earth.

V. 12. "The night": in so far as Christians are no more children or subjects of darkness (Col. 1, 12 sq.) the night has already passed for them; in so far as they still have sin clinging to them and are living in a world polluted and ruled by sin, it is still night for them. But this night is advancing more and more, nearing its end; and this so much the more the longer it has lasted already. "The day": comp. Hebr. 10, 25. It is of course the direct opposite of night: a life free from sin and all its consequences (comp. also John 1, 5; 3, 19 sqq.). Προέχουσεν: has advanced, has come near to its close; consequently, "the day has come near." Οὕτως introduces the practical conclusion that every Christian ought to draw from the state of affairs just described. "Let us put off": Paul includes himself, hence states something that applies to every Christian. When day comes we put off the night-gown; that custom of common life should be applied spiritually. "The works of darkness": a transition from figurative speech, which would require an expression like garments, to proper speech (comp. Eph. 5, 11). "The armor of light", not "works", because to walk in the light, as a Christian, requires fighting, namely, against the enemies that want to keep us in darkness. To live in darkness, or sin, necessitates no struggle or warfare with opposing enemies, since it is in perfect harmony with our flesh, the world, and Satan, those three arch enemies of Christian life. Comp. 6, 13; Eph. 6, 11 sqq.; 1 Thess. 5, 8; 2 Cor. 6, 7; 10, 4.

V. 13. "As in the day" (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, without the article: at the time when it is day): as a decent person walks in the day, avoiding

Christians should rather strive to become wholly imbued with the pure and holy spirit of their Lord and Master, and in providing for the wants of their weak and sinful flesh be careful not to arouse and nourish the evil lusts and passions dwelling in it by nature (14).

everything indicative of night and darkness. Since the "day" is near we ought to be prepared for it. *Ἐδσχημόνως*: in a proper, seemly, decorous manner, becoming those that walk in the day (comp. 1 Thess. 4, 12; 1 Cor. 14, 40; — 7, 35). *Κάμοις κτλ.*: dative of manner. The three pairs bear to each other respectively the relation of cause and effect: the first pair produces the second, and these two cause the third. "Revellings": feastings, carousals; "drunkenness": intoxications (a special feature of the preceding one, occurring also by itself); "chambering": (illicit) sexual intercourse; "wantonness": debaucheries, acts of lasciviousness (more general than the preceding one); "strife": contention, quarrel, wrangling; "jealousy": rivalry. The plurals denote the various acts and forms. Sexual sins, gross transgressions of the sixth commandment, are especially characteristic of fallen man in his natural state and condition (Rom. 1, 24 sqq.). The sexual instinct, implanted in man by creation for the propagation of the human race, is, in consequence, one of the most potent of human impulses; but it is to be, and originally was, governed by reason and conscience, having its legitimate sphere of activity solely in the state of matrimony. Since the fall it dominates natural man and is also one of the most dangerous temptations for Christians.

V. 14. "Put on": like a dress, though not in the sense of a merely external cover and decoration; it is rather, as already with classical writers, a figurative expression denoting the adoption of a person's mode of thinking and acting. Here it implies entering into the most intimate communion with Christ so that our mind and life is a mirror of His. Already by baptism, and in general by having faith kindled in his heart, a Christian has entered into this communion (Gal. 3, 27); but it must be kept up and cultivated and increased, and each and every progress made in this direction can be regarded as a repeated entering into that communion (comp. Eph. 4, 24; Col. 3, 12). What has been done and begun in baptism must be preserved and continued in life. "Provision for the flesh" is presupposed to be right in itself, for the "flesh", which in consequence of sin dwelling in it and using it as its instrument (Rom. 6, 12 sq. 19) is also weak and feeble, needs it; excessive and imprudent provision, leading to temptation and sin, is what is forbidden here. *Τῆς σαρκός* has an emphatic position: and as to the flesh that you still have and must provide for. "Flesh": here our body in its condition after the fall. "Lusts": comp. 7, 7 sqq.

## CRITICISM: TRUE AND FALSE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF REV. E. RUPPRECHT, BY  
REV. WALTER E. TRESSSEL.

[CONTINUED.]

*We do not accept this.\** What, now, is the *method* of this criticism? Without concerning itself about the paternal voice of external testimony and thence deriving authoritative direction for further investigation, modern criticism all along the line fumes with youthful self-consciousness and impudence and tumbles headlong, unguided, into the very center of the Pentateuch, in order to carry on "internal criticism." Here it knows itself to be a master. This is the realm of subjective liberty. The critic here feels unrestrained, and, undisturbed, can yield himself to his own acumen, to his fancy contriving all sorts of hypotheses, to the wide sphere of possibility. This is the method of subjective criticism. And yet this criticism, in its own favorite field, viz., inner criticism, could hear a voice that can claim, according to the rules of profane criticism, to be heard *first* in this matter, and which would set an objective dam in the way of arbitrary subjective acumen. It is the *direct* inner testimony. We are accustomed to call it the self-testimony.

How does this modern criticism conduct itself towards this method?

Let us look for a moment into the "Beilagen von Kautzsch"! We have only the first edition; the second has been rewritten. But even in it he again surrenders to the Wellhausen scheme, and this in spite of his honest declaration that, as against the great weight of the arguments in favor of tradition advanced by the later English and German publications, the importance of which he has

---

\* The author, in his "des Rätsels Lösung," 2. Abt., 1. Hälfte, XXIII and 408 p., Eduard Rupprecht, Gütersloh 1896, Bertelsmann, has in detail tested and examined on a solid scientific plan this external testimony for the Pentateuch from the whole literature of the post-Mosaic age, after proving the credibility of this latter literature, and has, indeed, accomplished this according entirely to the principles of a sound *profane philology*, without any dogmatic presupposition and without any hypothesis, and has shown that in *this* way one may escape the sea of doubt and reach firm footing, if one employs similar standards as, e. g. in the case of a Tacitus.

been led to recognize, it has caused him care and anxiety to submit to the views of Wellhausen. This declaration needs no commentary. On account of its candor we are tempted to be more kindly disposed towards the writer. Kautzsch asserts that "the Pentateuch in its present form neither by superscription nor subscription, nor in any other way, claims in its totality to be regarded as a work of Moses." We must, however, add that Kautzsch ventures to ascribe with certainty nothing of the Pentateuch as we now possess it to the pen of Moses. But what does Dr. Kautzsch say to Deut. 31, 9. 34? Here is a clear self-testimony, than which one can find nothing clearer posted up in a notary's office of our century. That the third person imports nothing against this testimony will be apparent to every one who may have noticed this custom among the ancient classical authors, in the Johannean gospel, in the prophets. Even if this self-testimony were allowed for Deuteronomy alone, then it would at least prove with inevitable force the authorship of Moses for the fifth book, so that Delitzsch, in the fifties, before his eye had become dimmed by Wellhausenism, designated as a lack of "scientific conscience," the effort to set this self-testimony aside. What profane philologist would dare thus to handle this testimony? But these theological philologists dare anything. Upon them, however, the burden now rests to prove to us with conclusive arguments that this clear self-testimony *cannot* apply to the *whole* Pentateuch. Naturally they cannot do this. Every objection raised by them has been thoroughly refuted by us: the inclusion of the Pentateuch in this testimony has been supported by grounds which Prof. Dr. Zöckler in "Beweis des Glaubens," January, 1897, reckons to the wholly "new argumentation," which he finds himself led to recognize in the author's "Rätsels Lösung," 2 Abt., 2 Hälfte (fourth volume of the complete work), Gütersloh, 1896, Bertelsmann, 458 p. The refutation of this demonstration will prove troublesome enough to the modern critics, in case they want to come with tenable arguments. The self-testimony Deut. 31, 9. 24 *can* at least, without doubt, refer to the whole Thora. But with that the duty of anti-criticism is fulfilled. That the testimony *must* be thus referred is proved by other additional arguments. How does Kautzsch make way with this clear, direct inner testimony? With an unprovable hypothetical assertion. It reads: "In Deut. 31, 9. 24 the 'Deuteronomist,' a *redactor living in exile*,

reports the recording of the Deuteronomic law." A critical figment, unsupported by a single documentary account! In this way one can set aside all self-testimonies of New Testament literature as well as of classical literature. It requires only a stroke of the pen. Why does not Dr. Kautzsch reject also the self-testimonies of the collective prophets? Why does he retain a Hosea, an Amos, an Ezekiel? Where, in these, is there even *one* such striking self-witness as at the conclusion of the traditional Thora, unbroken, connected as "one word," Deut. 31, 9. 24? No prophet testifies as is here testified that he executed the *recording* of his history. What all might have happened to these "authentic" prophetic records in the way of recasting, redaction, before they were brought, in a manner analogous to the production of the Pentateuch, by a "redactor in exile," unknown to us, or even much later, into their present written form? I find it more scientific to declare the collective prophets wholly revised, and therefore just as incredible as the Pentateuch, as Judges, as Kings, as Chronicles. Yes, if only Hosea, Amos and Ezekiel were not so necessary, in order not to appear before the scientific world as moving entirely in the atmosphere of one's own dreams, in order, on the other hand, to clothe the "system" with an appearance of being objective history! Then certainly this scientifically necessary step would be taken. But as the case stands, a simple arbitrary *halt* is made before Hosea, Amos, Ezekiel. But if it is desired still to regard this prophetic self-witness as valid, why not, further, the *ever recurring, entirely analogous* self-witness of the priestly codex: "And God spake to Moses (and Aaron)"? Or is that something different from the prophetic: "The word of the Lord came expressly to Ezekiel"? Ezek. 1, 3. Or: "The word of the Lord that came unto Hosea"? Hosea 1, 1.

Further, why does Kautzsch regard the self-witness Numbers 33, 2 as of no account? "The desert-stations belong to the *latest* constituent parts of the Pentateuch." So he says. But Dr. Green, Dr. Zahn, Edward Rupprecht have in their writings conclusively *refuted* this empty fancy. Refute these, if one can!

And the self-witness for the book of the covenant? Ex. 20, 22. 23; 24, 4? "How much of the wording of the covenant book is mosaic is another question." Does

Kautzsch know nothing else? Likewise nothing tenable against Ex. 14, 17ff.? No.

And Strack, as well as König, goes the same road in a somewhat slower movement. Cf. "Rätsels Lösung," 2 Abt., 2 Hälfte.

And Driver? That Dr. Driver has not touched the tedious, but richly rewarded first and most important (because most independent of the subject's pleasure) examination, according to the principles of sound profane criticism laid down by us under Part I, namely the testing of the "external testimonies" in the subsequent literature, is intelligible. For him hardly one of these post-Mosaic witnesses, from Joshua on, stands entirely secure. What does testimony help in such a case? And what he lets stand, above all in the prophets, that he knows, as already said to depreciate in the negative sense and skeptically; of course in such a fashion as would not occur to a thoughtful, profane philologist in the case, e. g. of a Cicero, unless we except the inferior critics Wolf, Peerlkamp, etc. Therefore we can all the more expect that one who carries on "inner criticism" *only*, will at least respect the most important profane-critical testimony from within the book and that he will subject the direct internal self-testimonies named by us to a conscientious, extended investigation, measured by the same standard by which the Pauline letters or the profane literatures of the Romans, the Greeks, the Assyrians are tested. For that is indeed the first business in "internal criticism." But we do not at all remember having read anything about this at our first perusal of Driver's Introduction. We therefore take the trouble to review a second time his "Hexateuch." At last, on p. 134, down in a foot-note, we discover two entire short lines on this *highly important* subject. There we read: "Deut. 31, 9, 24 can, for very good reasons, be referred only to the older legal kernel of Deuteronomy (Cf. 27, 3; Josh. 8, 32)."

Is that really all there is of the investigation of these most important passages to which I, in "Rätsels Lösung," 2 Abt., 2 Hälfte, in connection with the previously named remaining self-testimonies of the Pentateuch, had to devote under the section: "*Has Moses however written*" full 54 pages (pp. 353-408), presenting there the matter in antithetic-thetical form, in order conscientiously to weigh the "for and against," to show the indemonstrability of an "older Mosaic kernel" (that is, a revision of this an-

cient document until it reached its present form), and to arrive finally at a positive result that would be valid before the forum of profane philology? I have a right to expect that Dr. Driver, who, with our German radical and mediating critics, discards a thorough examination of the self-testimonies, will read my investigations, made with great pains, and *refute* them with solid arguments. For he pays just as little attention and time to the self-testimonies in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers as to those that appear in Deuteronomy.\* When the critic despises the natural and clear path of critical principles and instead walks into the confusion of subjective self-chosen paths, into this self-made critical garden of falsehood, then indeed one can reach no fixed goal. For what method of investigating a book remains for these German critics and for Dr. Driver after they have discountenanced a) the external testimonies, b) also the direct internal testimonies, self-testimonies? It is only the *indirect* internal proofs, the so-called proof from the *indicia*. That is the critical method applied by this modern criticism and exercising all its acumen. Everything else must yield to that method.

Let us hear, for a moment, what the rational profane-philology has to say regarding this last mode of argumentation which, in the present instance, is exclusively pursued! Dr. Blass says, to *repeat*, on p. 267 of his criticism "Des Echten und Unechten," among other things the following: "For the dialogue of Tacitus the well-known passage from Pliny well-nigh suffices for proof. Plato's laws are fixed with perfect security by the Aristotelian testimony. When, however, Zeller formerly maintained the unguineness of this work on *internal grounds*, one can see therefrom of how uncertain nature these 'internal grounds' are. But there are means by which we can free ourselves from the strongest external testimonies. *Of course no lawful means.*" The proof for subjectivism and the arbitrariness of this indirect method of proof lies plain before our eyes in the books of the modern critics. Without compass this whole critical fleet sails gaily away

---

\* Dr. James Robertson also, "Ancient Religion of Israel," German by Dr. v. Orelli, Steinkopf, 1896, although religico-historically conservative, takes the same position; but he is more suspicious of the distinction of the sources, not yet rejected by him, and which, according to him, does not injure the credibility. For the refutation of this literary optimism cf. my "Lösung des Rätsels," II, 2. Hälfte.

upon the sea, each one follows his own opinion, his own ingenuity, his own combinative fancy, his conjectures, his ego. And in a Babylonian jumble they navigate in all directions, only to return at last with their results, *per varios casus*, into the scientific central-haven, all with the confession in their books (which confession they, however, hold to be the modesty of strictly scientific inquirers): *Ignoramus*.

Dr. Driver never gets beyond this "Either or", "perhaps," "possibly." Let him show us a single *fixed* point, which is lifted above all doubt and all objection. The occasionally occurring assertory *assurances* do not compensate for the failing *vis argumentationis*. These forms of expression are yet frequent among such men as Cornill and his similarly-minded comrades, yes even in the writings of Strack and König. They accept, for instance, the interesting statement, full of contradictions, of Dr. Driver, p. 153: "These arguments are conclusive" and unite to make it—"probable," that . . . "nevertheless," "therewith it has, by far, not yet been said that." . . . Truly, highly characteristic of this sort of science.

But, in spite of these unsuccessful critical wanderings in Babylonian confusion, one thing the critics have not lost, the courage of youthful hope, which even the veteran of criticism "has planted beside his grave," as the poet says—the hope that after ever new journeys the little ship of a highly gifted critical ego, without compass, will finally reach the longed-for land of non-traditional truth and amid the clapping of hands of the assembled company there will be lifted the veil of Isis on this island. Happy optimism! Has not enough ingenuity been expended in one hundred and fifty years?

The pessimistically inclined Dr. König, on the other hand, has, on these vain joint excursions of inquiry preserved so much moderation and clear insight, that he quite recently "Neue Lutherische Kirchenzeitung 1897, No. 5" confessed to a lively interest in Eduard Rupprecht's works in the domain of Pentateuchal investigation, because he endeavors to welcome thankfully every ray of light that is thrown on a difficult question. He is not yet blind. He sees in the Old Testament modern criticism, which he thus far defends, a difficult question, in which every ray of light is gratefully to be welcomed. Therewith he acknowledges that after one hundred and fifty years of labor there still rests upon this question—*night*. Of course there is no



need of such rays of light for Wellhausen and his followers and for some of the mediating critics with their great swelling words. These critics have attained "assured results," and the question now is only as to "agreement respecting the relatively most certain *age* of the 'evident sources' of the Pentateuch." Alas, even these "assured results" are ever anew shown to be very unsafe. And so it is yet to be hoped of Dr. König that he will ultimately forsake the arbitrary subjective way of the indicia-method, and, preparing for an independent journey, will grasp the good old compass of profane-philological principles, with which Eduard Rupprecht, following the example of Ranke, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil, Green, *Lex Mosaica*, has newly landed, in his "Rätsels falsche and richtige Lösung," 4 volumes, on the long since discovered country of truth in the critical question.

But we proceed to pay somewhat closer attention to this purely subjective, indirect, indicia-method, dispensing as it does, with all objective guidance, the method which Dr. Driver recommends and practices as the right one, but which in reality has led him only to possibilities and probabilities of individual subjective value, but to no objective certain, i. e. scientific result, as every page of his book proves.

Wherein does this method consist?

It is said: Everywhere in the Pentateuch as it lies before us, plain indicia are found that this book a) is not a unit, b) does not come from Moses' time and Moses' hand.

What are these marks?

1. Linguistic, namely
  - a) the change of the divine names;
  - b) a different vocabulary in the different portions.
  - c) a different style of presentation.
2. Parallel accounts that exclude each other.
3. Single statements, so called *post-mosaica*.

On the basis of these marks the collective modern critics execute an "analysis" of the text delivered to us and which lies before us as *continuous*. In this same text, in our chapters, even in single verses, and parts of verses, often in defiance of all the logic of language, which would not allow a separation, they draw their lines of demarcation and assign these fragments and small particles to wholly unknown authors, fabricated by the critics, belonging to

widely separated times and designated by the letters E, I, P, D, R, authors concerning whom no trace of information has yet reached us. This is the work of conjectural science. And what now are the real boundary-stones of these lives? If one would not fall into total unprincipledness, one must leave the divine names alone. Dr. Green strikingly says that these names are the "starting point of the partition and of the entire hypothesis." But now if a scientifically valid conclusion is to be drawn herefrom pointing to different documents, then evidently the demand must be made that wherever these names of God appear there be constantly joined with them the other work of the sources which is claimed for the differentiation of the documents, namely a vocabulary peculiar to each divine name and which is not found connected with the other name, and, further, an entirely different diction or *coloratur* of presentation must be in evidence. Only when these three marks occur constantly and regularly is the conclusion permissible that different authors have wrought\* here at entirely different times. But no criticism can comply with this demand: even Dr. Driver does not think of doing it. He no longer emphasizes especially the divine names, but only works at supposed linguistic and material contradictions in order to arrive at the conclusion: this could not have been written by *one* and the same author. Therewith he fully abandons the old-critical principle that still offered the appearance at least of a firm thorough procedure.

Now Dr. Green in his "Genesis," 1896, and relying on him the author of this treatise in "Rätsels Lösung," 2 Abt., 2 Hälfte have most completely and in the most detailed manner proved,

a) That there is no such different vocabulary but rather that the long lists of words offered in defense of this theory rest on self-delusion;

b) That even the different coloring of the diction is to be explained on material grounds, and is not to be claimed in support of the theory that different authors have had a hand in this work;

c) That the partition according to the divine names combined with the remaining works moves in a continuous *circulus ritiosus* and the auxiliary hypothesis of the "re-

---

\* Cf. the more particular exposition in Eduard Rupprecht's "Rätsel des Fünfbuchs Mose, *falsche Lösung*," Gütersloh, 1894, p. 30 ff.

dactor" with his planless, arbitrary interference shakes the whole foundation upon which criticism labors, namely the certainty that the divine names and vocabulary as well as diction have faithfully been delivered to us *unchanged* from the sources by the redactor, so that the hypothesis is a "self-destructive" one, as Dr. Green pertinently and pointedly remarks;

d) That even the so-called parallel accounts are only an imaginary pretence, without any fixed basis\*, and that the differences were first *artificially* produced through arbitrary partition. A close inspection of Dr. Driver's analysis shows that he here moves along the same paths with the modern German criticism, with small changes. He divides chapters and verses, often contrary to logic, on seeming grounds and then he finds the differences. Accordingly, so long as the anticritical works of Dr. Green and Eduard Rupprecht are not refuted, there exists no reason for designating the indicia-argumentation of modern German and English criticism, conducted, it is true, with all the means of ingenuity, otherwise than as a wholly unfortunate attempt, bearing as it does everywhere the impress of unprincipledness of anti-logical and entirely arbitrary subjectivism.

Only the so-called post-mosaic might yet have to some degree a counter effect. But of how little importance these are as over against the great collective proof in favor of Moses, consisting of external testimonies, internal self-testimonies and irrefutable mosaica (which stand opposed to those post-mosaica, even if the latter were not entirely solvable), is proved by the fact that Strack still allows fourteen of these post-mosaica as valid, König however only six, Zöckler but two. Dr. Driver occasionally mentions some of them, but lays no decisive weight thereon.†

---

\* Cf. the searching criticism of Strack's separation of sources in the author's "Rätsel des Fünfbuchs Mose, *falsche Lösung*," Gütersloh, 1894.

† It is worthless to appeal here to one's "historical conscience," which is different in each one, a matter of impression. According to Wellhausen, it suffices for the apologists to have shown the *possibility* of the other view. That *can* be done. Even Josh. 24, 26 says nothing except that Joshua inscribed the covenant-renewal in the Thora-roll, whether upon an inserted leaf or an empty page, that it might not so easily be lost. Had he written it as a continuation of the *thorac* it would still be there as well as ch. 34. For in Josh. 24 only the *notice* is given, not this *covenant-document* itself transferred perhaps out of the thora, as one might oppose to my position.

Moreover, these collective post-mosaic have been faithfully solved by the author in the last volume of his "Rätsel," pp. 254-288. How many things ingenuity and fancy can prove by these indicia, when cultivated by themselves, of this we have a multitude of warning examples in the domain of *profane* specious criticism, which has long since been disavowed by Germany's thoughtful philology. We call to mind in this connection a few at least of these warning signs.

1. Dr. Green, in "The Higher Criticism," directs attention to the controversies over Homer and the Nibelungenlied; above all to the concerted attack by Wolf, Eichstädt, Clude, Benecke, especially Orelli in the beginning of our century. The excessive arbitrariness of this "internal criticism," which at last did not hesitate to regard three of Cicero's orations as falsified and, in order to uphold this statement, made the falsifier dishonestly insert into the letter to Atticus even the clear self-witness of Cicero himself for these orations—just this excessive critical arbitrariness is so highly symptomatic of the extreme critical procedure of our Bible critics over against Deuteronomy, the P. C., the Chronicler, that it will be worth while to read Madvig's account and condemnation of this "internal criticism." I have also in my "Rätsels Lösung," 2 Abt., 2 Hälfte, pp. 54ff., taken up this transaction in detail.

2. Further, I have communicated in the same volume, p. 248, a highly instructive case showing what scruples a preponderating "inner criticism" creates. This is the investigation made by Wackernagel, 1835, concerning Notker's works. The former, on the ground of "inner criticism" through indicia proofs, especially from vocabulary, style, etc., declared it as "certain" that the writings delivered to us by external testimony as Notker's translations of the Psalms, the Organon of Aristotle, the Marcianus Capella and the Trostbuch of Boethius could not have proceeded from him but owed their existence to different times and authors. This indicia-proof was so subtle that even Grimm almost acknowledged it as valid. Nevertheless, a secret reverence for the objective direct testimony held him back. He did not admit these conclusions into his grammar vol. II and III. And lo! in a Brussels manuscript of Notker's Rhetoric he found a hitherto unknown letter of Notker himself, where the latter expressly designated as his own works the writings rejected by Wacker-

nagel. With that the matter was settled. But a full-fledged sceptic might still have declared this letter of Notker's to be falsified. Scepticism can doubt *everything*, and it has already done so. It is a "moral insanity."

3. I direct attention to the more recent Shakespeare criticism, which robbed this poet, on the ground of "internal criticism," of his well-attested works, and to the Goethe criticism, which advocated the idea (Scherer) that the original form of Goethe's Faust was prose, and sought to prove it by many external and above all by inner reasons. In consequence of Kuno Fischer's work, 1889, there arose a controversy for and against Scherer. There was then discovered a copy of the original Faust made by the Weimar maid of honor von Göckhausen, and now we know that the original Faust, with the exception of three scenes, was written in *verse*.

In short, with a great deal of ingenuity and fancy one can prove anything one pleases by the indicia-method. In this way the epistle to the Romans can be quartered and every more vividly depicted narrative can be separated into two records, as Dr. Green has shown.

In this principal essay I must deny myself further illustrations of the uncertainty of this internal critical manner of proof.

Regardless of all this, the modern Pentateuchal criticism, Driver above all, makes this most subjective method of proof, exposed though it is to the most extreme arbitrariness and holding the last place, to be the first, yes the only proof. Is there any wonder that this criticism leads only to conjectures, not to *ἐπιστήμη*? Only when surrounded by the objective method of external criticism and the direct internal self-testimony can the indicia-proof in a *secondary* manner have scientific worth.

### 3. *The Moral False Method of Conscious Falsification.*

But the false method of this literary arbitrariness points us back to a yet more dangerous form of the false methods of modern criticism. It is a *moral false method* which discovers conscious falsification on the part of the holy authors and declares this falsification to be morally *inoffensive*, yes to be *consistent with the Holy Ghost of inspiration*. That is the very worst and is a still harder reproach. Let us prove this!

We take a look at Wellhausen's "Prolegomena." There the Pentateuch appears as a literary forgery of a

later time, its so-called "sources" are such only in name. In reality they are to him legends, that is fable books and tendency writings. And they cannot be anything else, for the oldest so-called source, his Jehovist, is placed by him in the period of the kings of Israel, is therefore separated from the events of the Mosaic time therein described by an empty interval of at least four hundred years. Accordingly, Deuteronomy did not appear complete until Josiah's time, i. e. about eight hundred years after Moses' time, the P. C. however after Ezra, one thousand years after Moses. What original worth such "sources" can have is shown by Bauer's criticism of the New Testament, which finds one hundred years sufficient to rob the evangelical records of all credibility. Most recently Sir William Muir, author of the "Life of Mohammed," in his excellent little book, "The Writing of Deuteronomy,"\* has instituted a parallel between the Pentateuch and the Mohammedan tradition. In that connection he expressly declares that his work has nothing to do with theological exegesis, but just as little with inspiration or even with general providence in the preservation of the Bible; it rests on purely human rational considerations. He treats of the idea of tradition, then of the Mohammedan tradition, and he reaches the result that the latter, although fixed very early in writing, appears covered with a colossal growth of legends and myths. He then asks: And now our modern critics presuppose that the biblical tradition without enjoying a single one of the advantages that pertained to the Mohammedan tradition, continued not only for generations, but for centuries, and indeed in so substantial, plain a form that it furnished the material for the Pentateuch's vivid narrative? Then he turns to Moses and Deuteronomy as well as to the modern hypotheses respecting these, the hypotheses both of Wellhausen and of the mediating critics. His words apply to both. For the mediating critics also, following Wellhausen, place their so-called sources 400-1,000 years *after* the events. Finally he places the Koran in the forum of modern biblical criticism and shows what the partitions of sources, in accordance with modern principles, would make out of the Koran, namely a mass of contradictory conjointly edited materials of entirely different periods. And yet it turns out from contemporaneous *external* direct objective

---

\* German by G. J. Metzger, Leipzig, 1896, Ungleich, 0.50 M.

testimony (!! ) with unavoidable evidence, as over against the "internal" and indicia criticism of the modern critics "*that the Koran is one of the most genuine works in existence.*" And yet the Koran, on "internal grounds," must have incurred the like critical fate with Deuteronomy and the whole Pentateuch, had not the *external* testimonies existed.

"The example of the Mohammedan tradition has shown us that, after the lapse of a disproportionately shorter interval than is accepted for the Hebrew tradition, *it has lost any and all credibility*, yea even lacks the unity which would at least furnish material for any historical composition." Thus writes the connoisseur of the Koran. Yes, the modern "separation of sources," this idol of our time and the other idol, the "editor-arrangement," leaving us no *original*, leads necessarily to Wellhausen's judgment: The Pentateuch is a collection of sagas and of knowing falsifications. But let Wellhausen tell us or Sir William Muir: "Whence the inimitable naturalness, the freshness, the personal naive description, extending even to the smallest detail and which could occur only by a contemporaneous recording of the facts."

"This simple book testifies for itself that it is truth and not fiction, an historical work of those times, not the echo of a forgotten tradition." Yet according to Wellhausen it is the latter. Consequently it is a book of fables and is a falsification. Quite right. For we find everywhere from Exodus to Deuteronomy the testimonies: "God spake to Moses," "Moses wrote," as already before stated. If a writer wrote that 500-1,000 years *after* Moses, *then he lied*. He committed a *knowing falsification*. The mediating school takes the same position. They do not take into account the self-testimony. Then all certainty ceases. But more: they *defend* these falsifiers. These are "mighty" men. Their word is *still* "inspired." So also Dr. Driver, who tries to justify a knowing falsification by the statement that "no dishonorable motive can be proved against them." That is genuinely jesuistic. *Pia fraus*. We want no fellowship with such morality. Here every *sensus moralis* and *christianus* ceases. A whole world separates us from him who holds such things to be even possible. It is the world of Christian, yea even of natural Kantian-morality. Whoever no longer regards the command of perfect honesty, sincerity and truth as *normative* for him in his critical examination, whoever supposes that

old God-fearing conscientious Jew capable of such a jesuitical act, whoever holds it possible that a great and powerful man in Israel could knowingly falsify "in Moses' name" such a Deuteronomy, filled with the spirit of holiest earnestness and tenderest love and deepest fear of God and then could warningly write the words Deut. 4, 2; 13, 1; 18, 20, i. e. direct these words *against himself*, whoever can consider such a "false prophet" as filled with the Spirit of inspiration according to 2 Tim. 3, 16, this Holy Spirit of most perfect truth and sincerity, as do our German mediating critics and Dr. Driver, according to his preface, where he strictly confesses himself to 2 Tim. 3, with such an one we will not lose one word more. There is wanting here all common foundation of *moral* agreement. The duty of perfect sincerity and truth cannot be demonstrated to a man. This common foundation is also lacking in the case of him who, like Wellhausen, stamps the P. C., with its ever recurring legislation introduced as a revelation of Jehovah unto Moses, as a priestly creation of 1,000 years after Moses, or at least passes this judgment on portions of this work as the mediating scholars do. But not only does the *moral judgment* separate us from such men, the provable *actual* state of affairs of antiquity does the same. Here Egyptology and Assyriology stand forth as our best allies. Maspero tells us that most of the holy books of the Egyptians were written by Menes prior to 3000 before Christ, and indeed *without any* interpolations. Brugsch adds: Every change of the text was as energetically forbidden as the change of the Egyptian form of the year. The Keil-inscriptions contain great curses for him who would change written regulations. Similar to Deut. 4, 2 is the injunction of a moral tract by Phtahhotep, 1000 years before Moses: "Subtract not *one* word therefrom and *add none thereto*." That was the morality and the literary sense of right 2500 before Christ, 1000 years before Moses, among the *heathen*. The morale of the moderns, which alas even the "believing" critics like Strack, König, Ottli, Driver, even Klostermann *defend* is the morale of "redactions," of "revisions," of "interpolations," of knowing "falsification" without dishonorable intentions. The heathen, but not modern Christians, feel that the lie *in itself* is dishonorable. By this moral libertinism, "internal criticism," unbound by the laws of scientific profane criticism and by the law of morality, obtains perfect freedom to build castles in the air out of its speculations. *Fata morgana!* How far have they all



strayed away from that heathen conscientiousness which knows only *originals*, *no redactions*, revisions, falsifications. We *must*, then accuse modern criticism along the whole line of following the false road of *moral arbitrariness* and lawlessness. The "literary" lawlessness is firmly intrenched in this moral lawlessness with its subjectivistic conjectures.

#### 4. *The Religious False Method of Unbelieving Faith.*

But this moral false method is for us the punitive consequence of a yet deeper false method. The latter is of a *religious* nature. By oxymoron we will call it the false way of "unbelieving faith."

We address under that term, of course, the "believing" moderns, i. e. the *mediating criticism*. For the radical criticism renounces even the Christian faith: it is naturalistic.

The mediating critics, including Driver, still claim to be Christ-believing in the Biblical sense. Are they so *in praxi* as they are *in thesi*? Let us see! We shall let Dr. Driver speak! His words are the echo of our German mediating critics. In his preface, p. VII, he says, similarly as they do, that the Lord, where He appeals to the Old Testament, expresses no judgment respecting the time of origin and the authorship. Let a man read John 5, 45-47 and ask himself whether the Lord utters no "judgment" in that passage to the effect that Moses really wrote the books which were *known* to Jesus and the Jews as the *common basis* of their negotiations, which books, according to Josephus, lay before them as Moses' writings. Elsewhere too, Jesus appeals to these writings and after His resurrection expounds them to the disciples. Luke 24, 27, 44. Yes, Jesus here expresses and assertory positive judgment, Dr. Driver may twist and turn as he will. And **He expresses it with conscious purpose.** For his whole proof v. 46 rests upon Moses' *person*, who, in his *writings*, v. 47, is to them the highest divine-prophetic authority, whilst Jesus' person and His words are nothing to them except the carpenter of Gallilee speaking without authority. The Lord, in order to secure Himself, condescends to their position. He appeals to them on the basis of the ancient, and for them firmly established, authority, which they had in the "scriptures", therefore in the Pentateuch (which according to Josephus, lay before them as the *book of Moses*) and which authority still addressed the Jews commandingly. With the words "for he wrote of me", He shows them the way upon which they would be *compelled*, from faith in Moses speaking to them in the Thora book,

to come to faith in the person of the still unbelieved Jesus. But their rejection of faith in Jesus' person is proof that they do not really believe the person Moses in his Thora. Therefore Moses himself will some day accuse them on account of their unbelief, whilst they, on the other hand, set their hope on him, v. 45. That is the meaning of the passage. There is but one way of escaping the clear fact that Jesus here expresses a *real judgment* on the origin of the Pentateuch—for to refer "his writings," v. 47, to merely no longer ascertainable Mosaic *foundations* of the Pentateuch is a modern discovery of which no Jew thought, nor did Jesus think of such a thing. This one way of escape, however, is: Jesus' argumentation here possesses no objective value. But that means: Jesus furnished His proof in an underhanded way. Now I do not doubt that some mediating critics will pay even this price in order to set aside Jesus' powerful word. For one perceives among *modern* believers very little more of true *reverence*, of *trembling* at Jesus' words as the words of divine majesty. Does Driver pay this price? Let the whole learned world pay it: *I will not pay it.* I repel it with *horror*. Even Meinhold rejects, on moral grounds, the rationalistic *conscious* "*accommodation*." He tries by way of kenotic *ignorance*, not-knowing, *unconscious* accommodation, to reach the goal.

Now I, a worm of the earth, have no insight into the mysteries of the Kenosis. I do not know what He who humiliated Himself and had power over Himself knew or did not know. He certainly *could* know everything that He wanted to know. For His not knowing was not *forced* upon Him as a *strait-jacket*. But this I know: What Jesus *said*, the Father spoke through Him, cf. John 5, 19, 30; 8, 26. 45ff. And *every* word spoken by Him is the pure truth. Therefore He *binds* His believers strictly to His words, John 8, 31, therefore also to John 5, 46-47. For that passage also belongs to His words.

He says also what we read in Matt. 24, 35. Inasmuch as His words *hold good* for His followers, as over against all "science", He would in such case bind them, according to the believing critics, to an—error for all time. "One should not shake his head at a king's word." Even a *simple honest* man, if he does not know a thing with *certainty*, prefers to say nothing. Or he confesses: I do not know. But he at least builds no proofs on what he does not know. Jesus said in one, and *only one*, instance: Even the Son does

not know that. Who dare multiply this instance? Whenever He *speaks*, He speaks the *truth*: if He speaks, that is *proof* that He *knows*. "Which of you professors convinceth me of sin, of one mistake? And if I tell you the truth, why do you not believe me?" It will be difficult for these pious critics to give an answer to this on *that* day. The Christianity of the apostles collapses with a fallible Christ just as well as with a Christ that knowingly accommodates Himself to error. *One* error on His part carries with it *infinite* consequences. Such fallibility applies at most to the "Mum Mum"-Christ, of whom even Kähler energetically reminds us. For even his trumpet no longer gives a clear sound. I want nothing to do either with Ritschl's or with Kähler's "unparalleled" Christ, although they still *call* Him God's Son. These are false Christs, invented by human ingenuity. And many so-called believers accept them. But I know only *the* Christ, of whom Paul speaks Phil. 2, 6-11 and John 1, 1-3, 14 and concerning whom the church makes confession in the Athanasian creed. Yes, "*full of truth.*" Against the great and dangerous lie of the ignorant or accommodative Jesus of our "believing" German theology I wrote my "Rätsels Lösung" 1 Abt. In that book I presented at length the testimony of this truthful One and of His apostles for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and refuted all possible critical objections. 2 Abt., 1 Hälfte, in the first pages, supplements these objections and their refutation. Examine my work and refute me if you can. Prof. Dr. Stelhorn, in America, in his theological magazine, finds this book "Strengthening to faith." It was intended to be so and, I hope, will by God's grace continue to be so as over against the Arianizing believing theologians. I wanted nothing more. I did not seek for glory.\* Yes, Dr. Driver ought to know that the

---

\* Over against Dr. Stelhorn, who devotes an extensive and highly appreciative discussion to this volume in his magazine, and to Dr. Zöckler, who also, in spite of some formal criticisms, still in his judgment on my complete work (Beweis des Glaubens, January, 1897) acknowledges this volume as confirmative of faith; also over against the editor of the Bay. Post. Korr.-Blatt., 1895, which called this 2d volume the best that has recently been written concerning the Lord's testimony for the genuineness and the credibility of the Pentateuch and the importance of this testimony for Moses — in opposition to these a certain A. St. in Monatl. Litt. Bl. of the Pilger Publishing House, Reading, Pa., discovers that I am an "incompetent" person, who "conceals his incompetency behind discourteousness and coarseness," that with my proofs from the New

Lord has undoubtedly given in John 5, 46-47 a *standard* judgment for his followers (John 8, 31) concerning the origin of the Pentateuch. He does not therewith enter "protest against any and all future investigation," i. e. *scientific, human* examination of this proposition. He only speaks out of His *immediate divine knowledge*, which has root in the *Father*. He does not "investigate." But as *God* He gives *restrictive directive* judgments as He does for human Dogmatics and Ethics in His statements, although He carries on Dogmatics and Ethics just as little as Criticism and Archæology. Without doubt Jesus spoke *everything* only for "religious" instruction. But John 5, 46-47 also served *this* purpose in the *highest degree*. And the whole credibility of the historical contents of the Pentateuch depends on the authorship of Moses (cf. the unanswerable proof of this from Dr. Green, Rätsels Lösung, Abt. 2, Hälfte 2, pp. 161-170) as well as does the religious importance of the same.

Thus also when the Lord employed something "na-

---

Testament I am "beating the air," that Christ nowhere says that "Moses is the author of the Thora," a discovery which even the negative criticism does not unanimously recognize. Evidently he has read or flown through John 5, 46. 47 with blindfolded eyes. He knows absolutely nothing of my further refutations of the opponents' objections on pp. 1 ff. of my 3d volume. Only, he makes merry over my remarks concerning Jonah's whale. He is the perfect echo of Dr. Holtzmann (in Strassburg) the rationalist's verdict on this volume, who also is acquainted only with the "whale and my coarseness" towards the blasphemers of Christ's authority and feels these things to be very disagreeable. Mr. A. St. forgets that there is a limit to the parliamentary courtesy of our time when one does not stand in a mere "parliament" but in *hot combat* against *rebels* to the absolute authority of Him Who, in *every* word, is "the truthful God and the eternal life," and binds us also fast to John 5, 46. 47 by His word John 8, 31. 32. In *bitter conflict* for Christ and Moses I stand on the side of the uncourteousness of prophets, of Christ, the apostles and our unparliamentary fathers from Luther on, not on the side of the polite mum-mum theologians of the modern indifferent world-Christianity, which *confesses* Christ, but does *not believe* in Him and pretends to know everything better than He does, the "worm" better than its maker. I act herein according to my conscience and with Paul refer my enemies to the court of last appeal according to 1 Cor. 4, 1-5. God helping me, I will never bow myself before men, only before One, before my God, in whose presence I lie in the dust. Let the worshipers of "parliamentary courteousness" in conflict against dangerous false doctrines know this once for all. *And there the matter rests*. That, where there are still *hopes*, I can employ another tone, is proved by that *same* rejected volume of my Rätsel, if one only has an eye to see.

tural" in His parables for a religious purpose, it was always *correct* and *appropriate*. But what miserable shifts are those of which Driver, with Strack, König and others avail themselves. They *weigh nothing at all*.

Summary: Herewith the critical "unbelieving faith" has been set forth. The radicals do not need this "wooden iron." Jesus is to them, without any "mum mum," simply Joseph's son and His words the carpenter's words, which the modern professor unhesitatingly changes according to the prevalent custom when they *do not suit him*.

This faith *in thesi*, but unbelief and disobedience *in praxi* where it confesses to combat the favorite anti-Mosaic notions, is the last and deepest, because religious, false method of modern criticism. It is bound neither to historical nor to literary, not even to moral courts: it does not even halt before the declarations of the only-begotten Son of God. It recognizes no objective directive for its "ego." The ego is everything. Therefore it loves the rallying place of the ego, the internal, indirect indicia-proof. Here its arbitrariness is unfettered. When the mariner sails off upon the sea towards the longed-for land, he thanks God for the stars of heaven and for the compass of human inventive skill which guides him in the right direction. Gladly and willingly he binds himself to their directions and guards himself *against* following the inspirations of his ego, his acumen and his fancy instead of these objective guides.

The investigator of the Old Testament scriptures, here the Pentateuch, also sails away upon the sea. The thoughtful critic thanks God for the objective directions that divine Providence, which knows our blindness, has granted us. He *joyfully* binds himself to the polar star, Christ's declaration. He looks up to the guiding stars of the apostolic words concerning the origin and the contents of the Pentateuch. He *rejoices* at the great consensus of the greatest spirits of the believing congregation, who in trusting obedience to Christ's words according to John 8, 31 have recognized the truth. He *thankfully* takes in his hand for his voyage the humanly tried compass of *sound profane philological method* and directs his investigation in accordance therewith. And modern criticism? Knows *nothing of all this*. The critical ego, erecting with the aid of acumen and fancy, all sorts of possible structures, would be free of all divine and human authority. With the self-consciousness of an immature youth it sails along in quest of the land of truth. Christ's word in this matter is naught to

criticism. The external proof is nothing, the direct internal proof is nothing. The moral law is nothing with its inexorable: Thou shalt not lie, *not even to attain a good end*. For God overthrows the liars. Criticism casts aside all directive objective forces, those wholesome restraints for an extravagant intellectual ego, and now the critical voyage goes ahead. The one starts in this, the other in that, direction, each according to his *liking*. And the result? It is "indeed without doubt—but indeed perhaps." In short: *Ignoramus*. And this Bible over which the "*Ignoramus*" hovers is to be the rock of truth which God has set in the world upon which Christ and His apostles and the reformers stood and could say: We have overcome the world! But the "Father seeketh the honor of the Son," which honor is denied the Son by unbelieving faith. As punishment for this disloyalty He blinds the moral, the literary, the historical eye. Everything becomes arbitrariness. That is modern criticism.

I tried to draw first the picture of *sound justifiable* criticism, and contrasted with that the picture of our modern criticism as represented both on the radical and on the mediating side. I found the latter on a fourfold wrong and fatal road, which cannot lead to scientific certainty in the domain of the Old Testament scriptures, but is like a compassless sea-voyage upon which even the heavens become night and the vessels, driving unguided in the most divergent directions, cannot escape with safety from their conflict with the waves. This is the road of *arbitrariness* in the historical domain, which in turn connects with the false road in the literary domain, and this latter departs from the clear and solid road of objective argumentation drawn from the external direct and the internal direct testimony (self-testimony), in order to follow only the subjective path of the so-called *indicia*, distinguished by caprice, impression, ingenuity, fancy—paths that have actually led into a labyrinth of possibilities and in the nature of the case *must* always so lead, but which bring us to no single really certain result, though the critics so often cry out boldly their *ἐβρηξα*. I have further shown that this indirect, unsafe argumentation becomes full-fledged unbridledness on the part of the subjective ego, and for this reason in addition to the others—that it no longer respects the universally binding moral law, but affirms *conscious falsification* of the holy originals through editors by means of additions, deductions, revisions, retouchings, exaggerations,

yes even by fabrication of self-testimonies, as we have these in abundance in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, actually accomplished by later pious priests; moreover, this criticism *defends* and *takes under its protection* this falsification of holy documents, contrary alike to piety and to truthfulness, as not blameworthy and as corresponding to the custom of antiquity. All, from Wellhausen to Strack and Ottli, follow the same road. Yes, so far as the mediating critics are concerned, who still believe in inspiration according to 2 Tim. 3, 16, among whom Dr. Driver, in his preface, places himself, these dare to take the horrible *last* step of making and declaring this unclean spirit of impious and untruthful, willful, deceitful book-making to be the organ of the *Holy Spirit of inspiration*, maintaining that these books are *still* the "inspired Word of God" for God's congregation. Thus one sinks downward from one stage of blindness to another in following *this* criticism until one has arrived at the precipice of "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit" without perceiving or willing it. One goes with the negative scholars *one* way, only, as *punishment* for this unfaithfulness which is both historical and literary, to sink *with* them into moral blindness, and *without* them, finally and by just consequence into blinding against the Holy Spirit of inspiration Who repels from Himself all untruth. And the lowest stage of all these ever deeper-sinking false methods is the *religious*, when one says: Christ is the Son of God and absolutely binds me, but then on wholly vain pretexts denies Him obedience so soon as His words bear witness for the Mosaic authorship and the perfect credibility of his Pentateuch. With this believing unbelief and disobedience one has rejected the safest compass, offered by God Himself, Who could protect the critical-sceptical understanding against wrong voyages and give it the proper *direction* for its journey, which would indeed proceed according to the purely scientific method but would be preserved from subjective by-paths.

Thereby the critical understanding, the ego, has lost its highest, objective hold, the moral-religious, as by putting aside the direct external and internal method of proof the ego has lost its objective scientific hold. Unfettered it can now follow its *impressions* and *fancies*, forge hypotheses and conjectures without number, and then it at last wonders why success is still wanting, because all its proofs turn out to be refutable. No, in this way one *can't* succeed.

If theological science would travel safe paths and attain assured results in criticism, i. e. in the *testing* of the Holy Scriptures, then nothing remains but to forsake *radically* and *finally* its former false methods and to take the rational way of sound profane philology, which in this domain has indeed not led to mathematical certainty, for "history" is not "number," but which, for *reasonable* men, has led to a *full historical* certainty. And for this certainty honesty and faith are factors that will not be turned aside.

That in this way one can arrive at human certainty in the biblical sphere also, the New Testament criticism of conservative tendency has proved up to the present time against Baur-Strauss and in the sphere of the Old Testament the school of Hengstenberg against the old rationalism. Against the new rationalism this has most recently been shown through the conservative critical investigations of Dr. Green, in America, *Lex Mosaica*, by Dr. French in England, *Mozaische Oorsprong van de Wetten*, by Hoedemaker in Holland, Dr. Adolf Zahn's Old Testament critical publications and the frequently mentioned four-volume systematical work by the author of this treatise, "*Das Rätsel des Fünfbuchs Mose, seine falsche und seine wahre Lösung*," Gütersloh, 1894-1896, C. Bertelsmann.

May this admonition to a radical conversion not remain unheard! What is not of the truth but stands in opposition to Him Who is the truth and Whose words outlast heaven and earth must at last perish.\* And that is the future of *this false* criticism because it stands in contradiction to Christ.

---

\* Dr. Wellhausen indeed says in his short letter of November 13, 1896, which he published in the "Exposit. Times," at the solicitation of Prof. Peake, Baxter's opponent, instead of a refutation of the penetrating book, "*Sanctuary and Sacrifice*," 1895, directed against him by Dr. Baxter: "The object of Baxter is not to understand me but to refute me." Undoubtedly the latter. Therefore also the former. That is the usual evasion when one no longer knows what to say. And he then adds: "Pity that I can not be consumed by fire: the truth, indeed, would not be consumed with me." But one sees from this that the old experience is always repeated.—the false teacher has so grown into his false doctrines that he dies for them as if they were holy "truth." Paul already foretold this 2 Thess. 2, 11. With the ever-increasing anti-Christianity we must be prepared for all that. And our Lord, with His "I am the truth," "If ye abide in *my* words," etc., is more than a thousand Wellhausens and all critics. That is *our* fortress.



**FUNERAL SERMON.**

SKETCH BY REV. L. H. BURRY, A. M., MASSILLON, OHIO.

“AUF WIEDERSEHEN!”—TILL WE MEET AGAIN.  
John 16, 22.

**FUNERAL OF A CHILD.**

Mourning Friends: The angel of death has passed over your home for days and years, and God has enabled you to rear a family in peace and blessing; but at last Death has crossed your threshold, as he will cross the threshold of every home, and he has taken your youngest child, that which, for the time being, seems to be your dearest,—a mere bud, instead of the full bloom flower, or the ripe fruit; and this bud he has carried to heaven, to lay it in the bosom of the Master.

In heaven, where such things are fully understood, the angels will have rejoiced that another bud has been brought to be woven into the crown of the Master; but we on earth mourn, that we are separated, and must take leave of those we have loved; and we look for consolation. And so we have come to God's Word to ask for the consolations it gives: it only has true consolation.—Among all the beautiful things that it says to those who mourn, I know of nothing more consoling than the words with which our Savior Himself took leave of His disciples, “And now therefore you have sorrow,” etc. I know that these are the words of Jesus, but nevertheless, when we recall the words of Jesus, to the effect that where He is, there shall His disciples be also, and that we shall live because He lives, I feel that we may put His words into the mouth of every departing, or departed Christian, who is an heir of Christ.

And surely this child, engrafted into Christ by baptism, was an heir. Let us therefore, put these words into the mouth of the child of whom we are about to take leave, or say for it, on the basis of Christ's words:

“AUF WIEDERSEHEN!”—TILL WE MEET AGAIN.

I. *“You now therefore have sorrow.”*

a. 'Tis sad to part, even in this life, from those we love. The German word “Heimweh”—homesickness, expresses the pain they feel, who are separated from those they love, even in this life.

b. But if this be true even when separated by earthly distances, what of the separation brought about by death? Oh yes, death always has a sting that God only can remove. Even in the case of those who desire to be at home with the Lord,—who are tired and weary of life, there are always some tender cords broken. How much more painful it must be, under circumstances such as these, where a soul has knit itself into our affections, and is but beginning life, when it is called away.

c. May we not well say: "You now therefore have sorrow?" I cannot say what career you had mapped out for the little one, what hopes lit up your eyes, but now they are all gone; a day or two and what a change!

So then we may well say for the child: "And now therefore have ye sorrow: but,"—Thank God for even that little word "but"—

## II. *"I will see you again."*

a. In the language of this world we say, that your child has died, and is dead, and many in the world understand this to mean, that with death the flame of life is blown out,—extinguished.

That were sad indeed, if this were true: if life consisted only in this, that we suffer and fight and toil, and hope, for better things to come,—and this makes up the sum of life,—and then comes death, and notwithstanding our hopes, ends all. Thank God for the light of Christianity, which shows us better things, which assures us; that

b. Death is only a sleep, whercin we close our eyes to this world and open them in the next. It is not an annihilation, but only a transplanting, and though our loved ones are taken from our sight, they still live. That is a true consolation already.

c. But better than that, our dear departed not only live, but we shall see them again and live with them. Of course they will not come back to us in this world, where they would have to undergo its trials, and sorrows, and cares again; and they would not, even if they could; but we may go to them, to heaven, and live with them before God.

I say we "may go" to them; for it all depends, under God, how we live and how we die. Not all who die, go to heaven; many who have promised themselves heaven, will never see it. Those five brethren of the rich foolish man, who was in hell, may often have soken of their "blessed

brother"; but nevertheless he was in hell. Only those who live, or at least who die in Christ, will reach heaven.

But surely this consolation we have, that this child is in heaven; and may I not say in its name, as far as you are concerned, "I will see you again"? You also have been purchased by Christ, have been baptized, etc. Be true to Him, and this hope will prove true: "I will see you again," and then—? Ah, yes,—when you shall meet again in heaven,—

III. "*Your heart shall rejoice and your joy no man taketh from you.*"

a. Oh, think of what it means, to live in that heavenly Jerusalem, with its streets of gold, gates of pearl, and walls of jasper, with Christ its light—

"I know not, Oh, I know not, what joy awaits us there,  
What radiancy of glory, what bliss beyond compare."

b. And this joy no man,—no death, no cares, etc., shall take from you, etc.

And so let us console ourselves. It is a separation, true, but only for a while: "Auf Wiedersehen!"—Till we meet again. God keep us, so that we, who take leave today in sorrow, may meet in everlasting joy. Amen.

## BIBLICAL FINDS AND RECENT DISCUSSIONS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

### SIDE LIGHT ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Old Testament is not to enjoy exclusively and alone the benefits of recent archæological research. Especially do the many thousands of papyri finds unearthed from the tombs of Egypt give the details and particulars of the public and private life of the New Testament period with a wealth of profusion that almost reproduces with photographic exactness the state of the civilization of those times. In addition new sources have been made available, especially in the inscriptions in the Bible lands contemporaneous with the era that saw the beginnings of Christianity and its

canonical literature, and these have been productive of excellent results.

Several recent examples of such new material will at once illustrate instructively the point in view. The Germans only a comparatively short time ago sent out an expedition to Asia Minor, but have already been fortunate enough to discover a completely preserved Greek inscription in Priene of 84 lines, that has called forth interesting discussions by such leading lights as the Berlin philologist von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, who occupies Curtius chair, the veteran octogenarian and historian Mommsen, and the brilliant church historian and theologian Harnack. The inscription has been published in full in the "Mittheilungen" of the Imperial German Archæological Institute (vol. 23). It consists of two parts, the second of which is of special interest to the New Testament student. In the first part there is a record of a proposition made to the Procurator of the Province in reference to a change in the calendar. The second records the decision to the effect that henceforth the various magistrates shall enter upon their duties on the 23rd of September, the birthday of the Emperor. In this connection it is that words and expressions are used that seem to have furnished the New Testament writers their models in depicting the Savior. These lines are all the more instructive, because, according to Mommsen, the inscription dates from between 11 and 2 B. C., most probably from the year 9 B. C. The lines in general read:

"On this day [i. e. the birthday of Augustus] the world has received an altogether different aspect. It would have been doomed to destruction if a great and good fortune common to all men had not appeared in him who was born on this day.

"He judges aright who sees in this birthday the beginning of life and of all living power for himself. Now at last the times are passed when man must be sorry that he has been born.

"From no other day does the individual and all humanity receive so much good as from this day, which has brought happiness to all.

"It is impossible to express in words the gratitude that is due for the great blessings which this day has brought.

"That Providence which presides over the destinies of all living creatures has fitted this man for the salvation of humanity with such gifts that he has been sent to us

and to coming generations as a Savior. He will put an end to all strife and will revive all things gloriously.

"In his appearance all the hopes of our forefathers have been fulfilled. He not only surpasses all former benefactors of mankind, but it is impossible that a greater than he should yet come.

"The birthday of this god has brought for the world the messages of great joy based upon him.

"From his birth a new era must begin."

Naturally this Savior is the Emperor Augustus, and the words in which he is deified read like those taken from the gospels. Professor Harnack, in an interesting discussion of this inscription and its relation to the gospel records, in the "*Christliche Welt*" of Leipzig, No. 51, declares that sentiments like these must have been common and current in the world of thought during the New Testament era, and furnished the method and manner in which the writers of the gospels and epistles gave expression to their higher ideas. They appropriated for their own use the words which were used for the worship of Cæsar and employed them for the worship of Christ.

Nor is the Priene find the only evidence that the New Testament parallels can be found for New Testament sentiments in the inscriptions and other literary remains of that period, which is only in recent years been found to have been so prolific and rich in letter. Von Wilamowitz, in his discussion of the subject draws attention to an inscription found in Halicarnassus and now in the British Museum, which reads as follows:

"Since the eternal and immortal nature of all [i. e. the divinity] has graciously bestowed upon mankind the highest good for their surpassing blessings, he, in order that our lives might be happy, has given us Cæsar Augustus, the father of his country, which is the divine Rome. He is the paternal Zeus and the Savior of the whole race of men, who fulfills all the prayers even more than is asked; for land and sea are in the enjoyment of peace; the cities are in a flourishing condition; everywhere there is harmony and prosperity and happiness."

Still more recently have some data, largely from papyrus finds, come to light that explain why it was that the soldiers, after the condemnation of Christ to crucifixion, mockingly denied Him as King. The philologist and Philo-editor, Paul Wendland, in *Hermes*, Vol. 33, has drawn

attention to the custom of celebrating the Saturnalia by the Roman soldiers by the appointment of a mock king, who was then slain. Every year the festival of Kronus, or Saturn, was celebrated, especially in the army. One of the number was selected to act as king, and upon whom royal robes were placed, and for a certain number of days this king directed the wildest carousals of his subjects, after which he was put to the sword. Mock imitations of these riotous celebrations of the Saturnalia king was evidently a favorite amusement among the Roman soldiers in the case of culprits who had been condemned and according to the manner of the times were handed over to the executioners as objects of sport, as also is the case of other persons who had incurred the displeasure of the soldiers. Philo narrates such a mock celebration as the part of an anti-semitic riot in Alexandria directed against King Agrippa, to whom the Emperor Caligula had given the tetrarchy of Philipp. A dirty Jewish beggar is taken from the street to represent King Agrippa; he is dressed up as a king, escorted by soldiers, is the recipient of royal salutation, while he with a crown on his head carries a stick picked up from the street as a scepter, and then is cast out (Cf. Philo, In Flaccun, Ed. Höschel, p. 970). The description is almost verbally the same as that of the mockery of Christ.

In the light of these facts it is evident that the mockery of Jesus by the soldiers of the cohort in the barracks was a specimen of sport which they were accustomed to engage in whenever they could. For there was a mock celebration of a festival of sport, and Christ was to them a Saturnalia king. That just this was the favorite sport in the case of one condemned to death was natural. The Saturnalia king dies as the earthly reproductive of Saturn, who dies as do Osiris, and Hercules, and Adonis, and Baldur and Siegfried. Saturn was the dying god among the heathen, and him who was the dying god of the Christians the heathen mocked by imitating the culters of their dying god.

Bible scholars have recently been treated to a sad disappointment and have again been reminded that not all "finds" in the department of Biblical literature are really such. Some months ago the erudite Syrian Patriarch, Ignatius Ephroem II Rahmani, announced that he had discovered the oldest Christian Liturgy and Church Order, belonging to the second century and accordingly even older than the Didache, which he had found in the Library of the United Syrians in Mosul on the Tigris, although the manu-

script itself was written as late as 1654. He came to Rome and published it under the title of "*Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi nunc primum, edidit, latine redidit et illustravit.*" The literary work was well done, the author showing an exceptional knowledge of the theological literature of modern Germany, France and England, and the whole elegantly published at the price of 25 marks. It did not take scholars long to discover that this Mosul Codex was no unicum, but that this testament exists not only in Syrian, but also in Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic, and that a Paris MS. of the book used by Lagarde was 800 years older than the Rohmani text. These things the discoverer learned himself when he came to Rome, but nevertheless insisted on the superior claims of his find. The manuscript itself contains the Syrian Old and New Testaments, followed by an Octateuch added as a part of the sacred writings, and consisting of such pieces as portions of the Apostolic Constitutions, the Apostolic Canons, just as was found by Lagarde in Paris. Professor Achelis, in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, No. 26, shows that the whole work has the undeniable marks of the post-Constantine period and its contents refute the claims of the finder for the second century. Professor Harnack, as reported in the Beilage of the Munich Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 50, in a lengthy address delivered to Berlin Royal Academy on the document has shown that it is the product of the fifth and not of the second century, but that for its own time it has literary and historical value.

---

#### ILLUSTRATED BIBLE EDITIONS.

German publishers have furnished Bible students with almost an "embarrassment of riches" in illustrated editions of the Scriptures. With the exception of the magnificent work of Pfeiderer, "*Die Bibel mit Bildern der Meister christlicher Kunst*" (Stuttgart, Süddeutsches Verlagsinstitut, 1889-1895, 3 Vols., 58 marks unbound), they have all appeared within the past twelve months or so. Pfeiderer's collection, however, will no doubt continue to hold a leading position among works of this kind, as he confines himself to the reproduction of what he regards the "ideal" type of church pictures, excluding the "modern-realistic."

His volumes are particularly rich in rare pictures, not to be found in any other collection, and the illustrations and letter-press are simply magnificent.

A classic of its kind is the "Bibel in Bildern," by Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld, which originally appeared nearly half a century ago, containing 240 Bible woodcut-illustrations, all the work of the one author, a master of this art, but on account of its price could be purchased only by a relatively small number. Now the house of Wigand, in Leipzig, has brought out a popular edition, costing only 10 marks unbound. The artist has selected for his pictures not so much the historical and archæological sides of the Bible as the theological, illustrating chiefly those scenes which stand in closest connection with the great fundamental doctrines of salvation. The Old Testament has 160 illustrations and the New Testament 80. The author has not printed a complete text of the Scriptures, but only those portions which the engravings are to illustrate. Schnorr's pictures are famous for the dignity and reverence in which Biblical scenes are depicted, and it is the honor generally accorded him that no artist since the days of Dürer has portrayed in so satisfactory a manner God the Father as he has done. While his illustrations are unique and reflect his own piety toward the Word, Schnorr shows that he has been trained by the models of the Italian masters of the sixteenth century, as Raphael, Michael Angelo and others. His individuality, however, is sufficient to exclude him from the class of "classicists." He shows throughout that he is an Evangelical and a German. In this respect he exhibits a marked contrast to the Doré collection.

In some respects modeled after the preceding Carl Schönherr has published a "Bilderbibel," with 108 woodcuts, after original drawings by himself and others, published by Naumann, in Leipzig, 10 marks bound. The Old Testament has 48 and the New Testament 60 pictures. This collection is well adapted for the general reader, although artistically a number of the illustrations will not satisfy the closer student.

Still more popular than the preceding is the ambitious, but somewhat disappointing "Tausendbilder-bibel," of which about one-third has now been published by the Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, of Stuttgart, the whole to cost, bound, 16 marks. The object of this edition is to furnish one thousand Bible illustrations, none of them original, but reproductions of the best specimens of Christian art of all ages and nations. It



appears, however, that special favor is shown to modern Bible illustrators, who so far have furnished about two-thirds of the pictures. German painters are naturally preferred, but the English and Americans are not overlooked. The reproduction is not in all cases such as would be expected from so famous an art publishing house, especially are many pictures too small. But nowhere else will there be found in such completeness the wealth of Scripture illustrations that the artists of many centuries and countries have produced. The volume is enhanced by the fact that historical data for each picture accompany the same.

The famous Berlin Old Testament specialist, Professor Herman L. Strack, has associated with himself Julius Kurth in the preparation of an illustrated edition of the New Testament, published by Grund, of Berlin, for 3 marks, and a "Prachtausgabe" for 5 marks. The price is phenomenally small, when it is remembered that we have here 79 excellent illustrations in 56 plates, technically finely executed. The pictures are intended to illustrate consecutively the life of Christ, even without any accompanying text, in other words a Picture Bible within the Bible. The selection is almost entirely made from classical sources, only Cornelius, Thorwaldsen and Kaulbach of the moderns being represented.

Another edition of the New Testament, by Nikolaus Müller and the Palestine specialist, Dr. Benzinger, the editor of the Journal of the German Palestine Society, has been published in Berlin, costing only 3 marks bound, although it contains 97 illustrations and charts. It is published "in remembrance of the dedication of the Church of our Savior in Jerusalem," attended by the Emperor and Empress of Germany in October, 1898. The object of this edition is rather scholarly and in the interests of Bible interpretation, pictures of Biblical scenes and sceneries, of sacred places and objects, that will enable the reader better to understand the text. It is thus modeled after the "*Illustrierte Hausbibel*," published in 1889 by Pfeilstücker, in Berlin, with about 1,000 illustrations of this kind, costing in second edition 17.50 marks. Of Müller and Benzinger's edition the Old Testament has also just recently appeared at a cost of 8 marks. The only objection that could be urged against the value of some of these pictures as aids to interpretation is that they represent rather the modern than the ancient land and people of the Bible.

For the present year, when thousands and thousands are engaged in the study of the Life of Christ, nothing more magnificent in the line of illustrations of the life of the Savior could be found than "*Die Vier Evangelien*," published by Vellhagen and Klasing, of Bielefeld and Leipzig. It is a collection of more than a hundred reproductions of classical German, Italian and Dutch masterpieces from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, on the life and doings of the Savior. These have been collected from museums, churches and private collections from all over the world, and being reproduced in a manner equal to the improved productions of any art publishing houses of the world, they present a Picture Life of Christ such as for real merit and worth cannot be paralleled in the literature of any other people. Full explanations accompany every picture. This magnificent folio volume is really a history of Christian art in pictures. Cost 48 marks, unbound.

---

#### THE DRUSES AND THEIR RELIGION.

One of the most peculiar of the historic sects found in the Lebanon, the Hauran and other sections of the Biblical Orient are the Druses, concerning whose religious views considerable uncertainty has existed. In the new and most scholarly work of the German Baron von Oppenheim, entitled "*Durch den Hauran, die Syrische Wüste und Mesopotamien*," of which the first volume in magnificent shape has recently appeared and which promises to be a classic and standard work on the Orient, we find some inside information on the somewhat enigmatical people, which the Baron secured from a Druse himself who had been educated in the French-Syrian college and was an excellent authority on Arabic and other contemporary literature in the East. The leading data of this account are the following:

The total number of Druses is about 132,000. Of these 40,000 are found in the Lebanon, and 30,000 on the bare hills of the Hermon, while 40,000 are in the Hauran, 5,000 in the neighborhood of Damascus and 15,000 around Arco. Chiefly for political reasons the Druses have tried to leave their Mohammedan rulers under the impression that

at heart they themselves were also Mohammedans. And in reality there are a number of points of agreement between these two religions, particularly in the observance of marriage and funeral rites. But the Mohammedans have always regarded the Druses as the greatest of heretics, more than the Christians and the Jews. Mohammedan theologians of all the various rites have engaged in polemics against them. Not a few of the Druse characteristics tend to awaken a sympathetic interest in them and their beliefs. Some of the specifically Oriental virtues are particularly strong among them, such as hospitality and a willingness to help those in need, politeness and the observance of outward forms. The high esteem in which the Druse holds women places them high above the fanatical envy of Islam. Polygamy is absolutely forbidden, and many obstacles are put into the way of the husband securing a divorce. Only such causes as infidelity and unfaithfulness in a woman being regarded as just causes for separation. The history of the Lebanon is the record of never ending wars and especially are the Druses divided into parties and sects. This may have been a chief cause why the leadership in those parts was lost to the Druses and fell to the part of the Mohammedans. But it is a notable fact and of great importance from an ethnological point of view that the Grand Emirs in the Lebanon were down to the beginning of the present century regularly of Arabic origin and were regarded by the leading Druse family as of kith and kin with themselves. Indeed a closer examination reveals the fact that the modern Druses are really the descendents of prominent Arabic tribes who in the second century of the Hegra, i. e. in the eighth century of our chronology began to settle in the Christian and Aramaic parts of the Lebanon. Other specialists, such as the Oriental explorer Luschen do not agree on this, claiming that the Druses of our own times are really representatives of the primitive inhabitants of Canaan, who preceded even the settlement by the Israelites, which conclusion is largely based on the physical peculiarities of this people. At the time when the teachings of Darage found a firm foothold in the Lebanon, South Arabian princes held the sway here. The records of the crusade period show this to be the case. In the beginning of the twelfth century the North Arabians, the Maon, came into the Lebanon and for nearly six centuries enjoyed full control. In the following decades there were continual

struggles between the Druses, thus divided between two family interests, and the Christian and Catholic Maronites and Metarites. The relation of France to the Christian population of the Lebanon has all along remained the same, but in 1842 England began to take the part of the Druses. In the international deliberations that followed the massacres of the Christians in the Lebanon in 1860, when thousands were ruthlessly murdered by the Druses, France demanded the execution of 1500 Druses and England responded by demanding the execution of the same number of Maronites, including the Bishop Tobia. The Porte effected a compromise by refraining from these executions but transporting the Druses' leaders to European Turkey and Tripolis. This policy of England doubtless aims to make the Druses a sort of counterbalance to the Christians of the Lebanon and to prevent the Jesuit "protectorate" of Syria from ever becoming a reality.

---

#### THE BIBLICAL HITTITES.

The Hittites are the most enigmatical and elusive people in the early Biblical records. It is very evident that they must have been a powerful nation, but both the Old Testament, as also the classical writers, are provokingly silent in reference to their character and record. Fortunately the inscriptions of the Euphrates and Nile valleys have proved to be better sources of information, and what the accurate scholarship of the modern archæologist and linguist has discovered has been given in compact form by one of their prominent representatives, Professor Hugo Winckler, of the University of Berlin, in a small work entitled "*Die Völker Vorderasiens*," from which source chiefly we glean the following data and details:

The Hittites represent the oldest civilization of Asia Minor and adjoining lands and constitute a counter current to the type of culture that proceeded from Arabia and the Euphrates valley in pre-historic times. They date back to the beginning of the second and even into the third pre-Christian millenium. While originating in Asia Minor the Hittites soon spread over Syria and even into Mesopotamia and Babylonia. In all these districts are found monuments of their history in the shape of inscriptions. It is

not impossible that they may have originally come from Europe, and for this reason not a few scholars identify them with the Pelasgians, who preceded the Hellenes in Greece, or that they were of Celtic origin. The monumental remains of the Hittites that have been found in recent years are quite numerous, but naturally do not meet in this respect the magnificent discoveries made in Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria. The most extensive collections are at Boghaz-Kioi, in Cappadocia, while the ruins of the grand palace and other remains at Sindshirli, in Syria, have been especially investigated by German savants under the leadership of the veteran Dr. Koldewey. In Syria most of the inscriptions are found in the southern districts, as far as Hamart, while a goodly number have also been discovered in Cilicia. The people of whom these all bear record are the Biblical Hittites, otherwise also called Chatti. Unfortunately these inscriptions have not yet been interpreted to the satisfaction of all concerned, and for this reason only the reports of the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the cuneiform inscription of the Euphrates and Tigris lands offer safe information. From these it appears that the Hittite civilization was a most decided factor and force in the affairs of all Western Asia for centuries antedating our ordinary sources of information about those regions. The name, however, is not the appellation of a single nation, but rather of a group of peoples who at different times occupied the whole territory of Western Asia as far east as the Euphrates. The inscriptions of the Hittites, while yet silent, notwithstanding the shrewd investigation of some of the best scholars of Europe, each of whom claims to have found the "key" to their interpretation, are peculiar and unique in this, that they consist of *raised* letters, and are not cut into the stone or clay, as is the case in both Egypt and in Mesopotamia. The language has not yet been sufficiently determined as to its character and connection. Some indeed claim that it is Semitic and that the Hitties are kindred and kin to the Hebrews, and others regard it as an Indo-European tongue. But the facts so far in our possession rather indicate that the Hittites were neither Indo-European nor Semic, but represent a national type of their own.

The Hittites and Chatti, appear in Babylonian history more than thirty centuries before Christ, and the earliest are located on the Upper Euphrates, and not on the historical grounds of the race, on the Halys river. In other words

they are found at this period on the Biblical Mesopotamia. The special name by which this section is known is Mitani, which people, as is known from hieroglyphic source, came into collision with the Pharaohs of the former eighteenth dynasty. In the famous El-Amarna tablets, dating back to the fourteenth century, are found a number of letters from the Hittite King Dushatta addressed to the Egyptian Kings Amenophis III and Amenophis IV, the former sending the latter presents and additions to his harem. These letters, written in cuneiform character, are a singular illustration of the diplomatic language not expected at so early a period.

While these Undom are the oldest branch of the Hittites of whom we have anything like extensive records, they are not the oldest Hittites now known to the historian. Already before that time it has now been seen that the Hittites were a strong and powerful race, that by its warlike proclivities and prowess was able to keep in subjection the great bulk of the neighboring peoples, and at times threatened the existence of even such powerful nations as Egypt and Babylonia. When scholarship shall have achieved the triumph of solving the inscription enigma of the Hittites as it has done in the case of the hieroglyphics and of the cuneiform literature, it can easily be possible that the whole face and aspect of the pre-historic Asia, and much in earlier Biblical history, will be seriously modified.

---

#### “REFORM CATHOLICISM.”

The tendencies toward the development of a more or less pronounced type of independence of thought has become so prominent and varied within the Roman Catholic Church in recent times that this can almost be regarded as an international phenomenon in that fold. The “Away from Rome” crusade in Austria has according to official reports within the first half of the present year resulted in 3275 persons deserting that church; in France the movement headed by Abbe Bourrier has now over more than two dozen priests, while in Germany the Schell propaganda for a reconciliation between modern scientific thought and research with the spirit of the Church of Rome has not been crushed by the edict of the Vatican. An evidence of this is seen

in the pamphlet recently published by the priest, Dr. Joseph Müller, entitled "Der Reformkatholicismus," in which he outlines a series of changes to be made in the present policy as dictated by the Ultramontanism at present controlling the destinies of that church, which changes are all consistent with the spirit and history of the church. The leading changes are the following:

1. A recognition and utilizing of the modern progress in all departments of scientific research, especially in philosophy and theology; especially is the supremacy of the modern Jesuitic New-Thomasic, or revival of the rule of the philosophy of Thomas of Aquinas to be antagonized. Roman Catholic scholarship is now to make use of the best methods and manner of modern learned scholarship and not stand coldly by, leaving progressive modern scholarship in the hands of the Protestants or non-believers.

2. The students of Catholic theology and other students of the church are to seek their knowledge at the Universities or the central seats for the best seats of the scholarship of the age. The separation and segregation of Catholic students, apart from those of other creeds is to be discouraged, and so especially the tyranny of theological students in diocesan seminaries. Again the establishment of exclusively Catholic Universities, such as has been attempted in Freiburg in Switzerland, is to be discouraged. Catholic young men are to seek higher education in the Universities of the state, where the spirit of free research prevails.

3. The reintroduction of diocesan synods, thus securing to the lower ranks of the clergy the permission to consult among themselves in reference to the needs of the souls entrusted to their care.

4. Greater and closer connection with the laity, and participation in the charitable work along inter-denominational lines; indeed the participation of the clergy in all the public movements of the times in which they can take part without a sacrifice of principles.

5. A removal of the complaint that the laity has not the Bible, as this lack and want is a just hindrance to their instruction and spiritual progress.

6. Avoiding all un-Christian criticism and polemics over against non-Catholics as well as uncharitable judgments passed against those within the church who have

opinions of their own different from the views current among fellow church people.

These are the points which are demanded in the name of "scientific" reform by the author within the fold of the church, while the second series of demands, namely those of a practical character deal with quite a list of living religious problems of the day. In summary form these practical points are the following:

The Ultramontane assumption of superiority and right of rule in the matter of theological and other opinions is to cease, especially in the case of those who are studying theology and preparing for the brotherhood; the idea that the church can gain her ends better by political machinations and election tricks is to give way to methods and manners more in harmony with the high and spiritual character of the church; the deep chasm existing almost everywhere between the lower and the higher clergy of the church is to be bridged over; the miserably low salary paid the clergy, especially the lower, is to be increased; the terrible abuse of the Index affair is to be remedied by entrusting this matter to competent hands; the religious orders are to be reformed. A decided Philipian against the Jesuit order closes this part of the program of Reform Catholicism.

---

## THE PASTOR AND HIS GREEK TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

That this is a period of intense Bible study, both in the technical and the popular sense of the term, admits of no doubt or debate. The interest in Biblical research is both wide and deep. But it is equally certain that the direct study of the Scriptures in the original languages is not as popular as it was in earlier generations. In fact, it is perhaps an open question whether for the average minister of the gospel the independent and profitable study of the Greek New Testament is not practically one of the lost arts. A glance at the Biblical literature of the times, especially the theological magazines and journals which exert an influence and serve as a medium of instruction to a much greater degree than this is done by books and volumes, shows how little the philological and exegetical investigation of the



Scriptures is in the forefront of general interest. A comparison of the numbers that appeared a generation ago of such a staid and solid journal as the "Studien und Kritiken" shows that the English speaking theological world is not the only place where New Testament scholarship has deteriorated. Repeatedly have examination committees of various state churches in Germany published their complaints that candidates for the holy office have no longer the mastery of the New Testament in the original which was common years ago. The character of Bible study has changed materially in recent years, and it is a question whether the gain has been greater than the loss. The centre of interest is now the literary side of the Scriptures and not so much their contents as divine revelation of heavenly truths. It certainly is a matter of congratulation that history, archæology, and kindred disciplines have contributed so much to the better understanding of certain portions of the sacred books. There can be no doubt as to the services that have been rendered by these auxiliaries; but it is the part of wisdom to put a proper and judicious estimate upon these helps and other achievements. In the nature of the case they can materially affect only the externals, the forms of the Word but not its contents, the revelation of the great mysteries of salvation, of the plan of God for the redemption of mankind; of the nature and consequences of sin, of the person and the work of the Redeemer. These are matters of revelation pure and simple, and neither internal literary analysis and readjustment of sources and of the various stratifications that make up the body of the Old and of the New Testament writings, can contribute materially to the elucidation of fundamentals and essentials that belong not to the sphere of the natural but to that of the supernatural solely and alone. It is true that the adoption of such radical reconstruction as proposed by the critical school, with its naturalistic tendencies, can and will materially change the whole conception of even the essentials of the Biblical religion and its historical developments; but just in so far as this radicalism is accepted the Scriptures must and will lose their unique position as the one and only true revelation from God and sink to the level of the "sacred books," of which it will constitute only one of a class, at best a *primus inter pares*. What a minister would do on the pulpit with a critical conception of the Biblical religion is hard to understand. It is true that we under-

stand the history of Israel better than ever before as a fact and factor in Oriental history is relation to the other history making nations of the East, because of the wealth of archæological data that have been unearthed in the Nile and the Euphrates and the Tigris valleys; and it is even true that the proper understanding of the historical background of the New Testament, such as the Pharasaic system of dogmas and doctrines and the spirit of these teachings enables us to understand better than before the forms in which Christ and His apostles taught, even such an important point as justification by faith alone, which by the antithesis to the errors of the day, becomes all the more resplendent in its truth; yet it is also and equally true that all of these new sources of information have not made any noticeable improvement in our understanding of what for both minister and earnest Bible students in general must remain for all times the great centre of concern. Gratified as we must be for all the good things the current study of the Scriptures and the archæological finds in Bible lands, the proper estimate of their value can be found only when it is remembered that in the nature of the case they can affect only the incidentals and accidentals but not the essentials of the Scriptures.

At any rate the minister of the gospel and indeed the close and conscientious student can dispense with these much better than he can with the ability to utilize for his work the *ipissima verba* of the divine relation. It is probably the part of wisdom to draw attention once again to the relative value and worth of the New Testament Greek for the official teacher and interpreter of the Word. Both as a matter of principle and of profit the direct study of the Scriptures in the original tongue, especially of the Greek New Testament, should be one of the pastor's chief concerns. The fundamental principles of Evangelical Protestantism demand this of him. A Roman Catholic can afford to ignore and neglect the study of the Word, as it is his office only to teach what his church commands. His chief virtue is obedience to his superiors. Not so the Protestant. The formal principle of the Reformation claims that the Scriptures and the Scriptures alone are the sole rule and guide of faith and life, and makes each one personally responsible for his creeds and deeds. The office of the Protestant minister consists in the interpretation and application of the Word. As far as matter is concerned he is to

interpret the Word. He is not called upon to be original except in the manner and method of interpretation and application. The fidelity to his calling consists in his fidelity to the Word. If he is not a faithful student of the New Testament in the shape and manner in which it was revealed, he cannot possibly interpret his message at first hand. Every student of the Scriptures who cannot make independent use of the original Greek of the New Testament is entirely dependent on secondary sources for his understanding and use of the Scriptures. Only in so far as he can depend on others, and others through commentaries, translations and the like have made it possible for him even to read the message he is to preach and proclaim, can he do his work at all. As far as he is concerned his knowledge of the Scriptures is all second handed.

And what principle demands, profit and policy insist upon. The practical utility for the Bible student of an ability to study independently his Greek New Testament can be easily underestimated but not easily overestimated. The oft repeated principle, that a translation can never take the place of the original contains a good deal more truth than it is usually credited with, and is especially applicable for especial reasons to the Greek New Testament. The Greek is a marvelous tongue, by its very nature adapted to the exact and precise expression of thought, adapted as perhaps none other for photographing thought with most marked fidelity. An exact knowledge of the moods and tenses, e. g. of the Greek verb enables a person to work out with almost mathematical certainty the thoughts of the speaker. There is scarcely any room at all left for doubt or uncertainty as is the case so often in English and modern tongues. In many cases, as e. g. different forms for the expression of definite and indefinite relative and temporal sentences, express shades of thought which can be reproduced only by an expansion of thought in a modern language. Greek is the natural language for logic and philosophical thought, for the exact definition and description of deep truths. It is true that in the New Testament not all of these fine features are found, which only an interpreter can see and utilize who really knows what the functions of the various forms signify; but the Greek of the New Testament in both its form and syntax are essentially Greek and much of it is excellent Greek.

But in order that this fine gold may really be found, an independent scholarship is necessary. It is useless to hide

the fact that the mastery of the Greek is not an easy task. While the Hebrew, with its handful of forms, and these all developed from two dozen primary forms, and its crude syntax and small *copia verborum* can be acquired in so far as it is necessary for practical and not for special philological study by two years' average work, to acquire a mastery of the Greek is really the task of a lifetime, and just in the New Testament department there is probably more unconscious self-deception practiced than in any other line of study. The study of New Testament Greek has often acquired the reputation of being "easy," because the students unconsciously, perhaps, make use of their knowledge of the contents of the Scriptures in translation as a "pony" in reading the Greek. An independent knowledge implies that a student knows the exact functions of the forms of the language, the modes and tenses, e. g., as these are described in Burton's excellent work; that he knows what the presence or the absence of an article implies, and, in short, understands the phenomena of classical Greek, as also the unique features that characterize the New Testament ideas. The use of an "interlinear" translation for this purpose is poor philosophy and poorer pedagogy. For one who has not a knowledge of the Greek it is only an easy-riding "pony" and for others it supplies only what is already perhaps better known. Interlinear translations can lead only to superficial scholarship and as often mislead as they direct aright. They are of evil and lead to evil.

Another element that the student of the New Testament Greek dare not ignore is the Hebrew. The late Syriac and New Testament specialist, Isaac Hall, once stated that the best dictionary of the Greek New Testament is a Hebrew dictionary to the Old, and this paradoxical statement is just strange and peculiar enough to contain a strong proportion of truth. Although written in Greek, the New Testament in many of its parts and portions, and that too not only in those parts that speak of higher and revealed truth, but even in its historical sections would not have been intelligible to a Demosthenes or a Plato or a Xenophon. Nor would the trouble be with the forms and the syntax. The handful of peculiar forms found in the New Testament Greek are scarcely enough in number or importance to constitute a respectable dialect, and in fact since their parallels have been found in considerable number in the Greek of the papyri of this period found in recent years has virtually ceased to be a dialect; then, too, a classical

Greek would be prepared to worry through the various uses of *ἵνα* and similar syntactical peculiarities, but when he comes to the word *λόγος* or to *ρῆμα* as the equivalent of *dabar*, or "thing," and countless cases like these, he could do little or nothing with such a book. The Hebraistic thought and the manner of expressing it is a pronounced feature of New Testament Greek, more so than is generally considered to be the case. In fact it is impossible for anybody to make a really independent study of this dialect without some knowledge of the Hebrew. Its silent or expressed influence is felt in every book and chapter and almost in every verse of the New Testament, and appears chiefly in the definitions and meanings of the words, and is not confined to the technically Biblical terms, as these have been derived perhaps through the awkward translation of the Seventy, but also in such common words as *βάλλω*, *ῥίπτω* and the like. Again, syntactical peculiarities that otherwise seem unexplicable yield readily to a rational explanation from this point of view, e. g., the seeming inability of the New Testament writers to be exact in the use of the government of the prepositions, such as *ἐν* and *ἐν* are readily explained when it is remembered that the Greek writer was a Hebrew thinker, and as such did not make these distinctions. The frequent use of the future as an imperative is attributable to the Hebrew imperfect or jussiv used for this purpose. When, e. g., in Matt. 6, 13, after all the other petitions of the Lord's Prayer had been expressed by the imperative, the sixth comes in the shape of an subjunctive, it is only necessary to remember that in Hebrew no negative imperatives are used, and this construction was imitated by the Hebraistic writer of Matthew. Examples of this kind could be produced almost without number.

Indeed no man is ready for the real study of the Greek of the New Testament until he has a knowledge of the essentials of classical Greek and at least an elementary knowledge of the Hebrew. It is for this reason a poor pedagogical wisdom to begin the study of New Testament Greek before such knowledge has been gained. It belongs properly to the close of a college curriculum, and not to the beginning or the middle, and should be preceded by some study of the Hebrew. Worst of all is the idea of beginning the study of Greek by taking up the New Testament.

It is much to be regretted that the special helps for the study of New Testament Greek are so meagre and so few. With the exception of Burton's valuable work there is little of original in the English that can be utilized by the average student. It is to be hoped that the new revision of Winer's grammar will be translated; but there is sore need of a smaller and more practical book. Blass' is not satisfactory and tends rather to confuse. Indeed New Testament philological literature has been and has a much neglected field in recent times. The compiler of a good, handy New Testament grammar and dictionary, based on scientific principles, would deserve the gratitude of a generation of Bible students that ought to use its Greek New Testament a good deal more than is now done.

---

## THE BIBLICAL AND OTHER DELUGE STORIES.

That the story of a deluge in the early ages of mankind appeared in many shapes and forms in the recollections of a multitude of peoples was recognized on all hands. but the significance of this phenomenon has been variously interpreted, especially the fundamental problem as to the dependent or independent nature of the Bible story over against those found elsewhere. Only the adoption of the historic co-comparative method has made it possible to judge of this matter without prejudice and the discovery of a goodly amount of new matter, especially in the cuneiform diggings in the Euphrates and Tigris valley, has made the application of this method all the more fruitful. The best results and the latest opinions on this old problem in the light of new facts and methods we find in a masterly work by the famous archæological Professor Hermann Usener, of the University of Bonn, who has just published a new work on the subject entitled "*Die Sintflutsagen*," from which we glean the following data and conclusions:

The chief sources from which are gathered the traditions of the ancient peoples on the subject of the flood are 1) The cuneiform account discovered by the English savant, George Smith in the ruins of old Nineveh, which consists of 11 tablets, and reports that Sit-napistim (i. e. he who escaped) by the command of the goddess Ea had prepared a great ship, into which he placed his family and

the seed of all living things, and in this way they were all saved, and that afterwards he and his wife were by the god Bel changed into divine creatures and transferred to the mouth of the river. 2) The Biblical account of the deluge concerning Noah as compiled by the Jewish narrator of the Pentateuch and in the more artistic composite of the later Elohist, which two reports in a number of points do not harmonize. The Jewish report is dependent on the Babylonian, as is seen among other things by the old idea retained by the Jahvist, that Jahve was pleased at the sweet savor of the sacrifice of Noah, an idea entirely in consonance with the polytheistic deluge stories of the Babylonians. 3) The East Indian story of the flood, which tells us of Manu, the first man, the son of the Sun god Vivasvat, who while washing happens to get a fish in his hand. The fish asks to be spared and promises in return to save his benefactor from a great flood. Manu grants the request, and the fish constantly increases in size and later when the flood has come, it pulls with its horns through the water the ship which Manu by the command of the god has built, until he has safely deposited it on a high mountain. With the help of the wife who grew out of a sacrifice consisting of butter and milk the man becomes the head of a posterity. 4) Among the Greeks the deluge story is of a comparatively late development. Homer as yet knows nothing of such a tradition, but Hesiod probably knew of it. Our own knowledge of the Greek story is drawn from the Apollordian library of the second Christian century, while shorter accounts are found in Pindar and in Ovid. This is the famous Deucalion story with Pyrrha as wife, and the place of landing their vessel is Mt. Parnassus. Traces of other shapes and forms of the Greek traditions are also found, especially in Attica and adjoining districts. And what do all these deluge stories signify? They are not the reminiscences and memories of great revolutions and convulsions in nature during the days of primitive mankind, but rather they are the representation and picture of the beginning of light, namely the fundamental idea is that the god, no matter by what vessel he is carried, is raised by the flood upon the peak of a mountain or on an island and is placed among the gods. A close comparison of the accounts found in all these stories of an individual who eventually is through the waters raised to the peak of a mountain, shows that in each case the god of light is meant, be it Perseus, or Telephus, or a god of the

springtime or of nature which under the influence of the rays of the spring sun develops into life, such as Adonis, Dionysius or others. In German mythology we read the same concerning Sigurd's birth.

A comparison of the different accounts shows that the Indian story has been developed independently of the others. This tradition says nothing of the cause of the deluge, namely the depravity of man, nor of its purpose, namely the destruction of man, nor of the intentional preservation of the various kinds of animals, nor of the sending out of doves, all of which are characteristic of the Semitic story.

The Greek story approaches nearer to the Indian than to the Semitic, especially on account of what it omits, although in some points it agrees with the Biblical and Semitic namely in assigning the sinfulness of man as the cause of the catastrophe. The Semitic type of the story in its details shows that it is the development of a long literary process, which has added poetic particulars to the original account. If these additional and later elements are subtracted the substantial agreement with the Indian and the Greek phases is apparent. The unique features of the Semitic story, especially the account of the wickedness of mankind, are additions of later Semitic and especially Jewish theology, which sources are also responsible for other details of a secondary nature.

---

## NOTES.

THE semi-centennial of the old reliable *Litterarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* deserves at least a passing notice. It has been edited by a Zarneke ever since it was established in 1850, first by Fr. Zarneke and now by Professor Dr. Ed. Zarneke. In these days of intense specialism the *Centralblatt* has continued to be what it was in the beginning, namely a comprehensive and complete survey of the leading literary and learned activity of the entire German speaking world. This it does in the shape of reviews, extensive bibliographical accounts, literary news and notes, university reports, and the like. The reviews number about thirty in every issue and generally are classical in their brevity and pointedness. Among its more than one thousand contributors are found the great majority



of university men and other specialists in the country. It is this fact that explains the exceptionally high quality of the contents of this journal. A bird's eye view of what the Germans are doing in the scholarly research and literature can probably be gained in no way better than by a perusal of this old favorite. The publisher, Eduard Avenarius of Leipzig, announces that an index for the past fifty years of this periodical will be published in the near future.

---

SWITZERLAND did the pioneer work in making it possible for women to secure a university education in Europe, and the little republic still is the most liberal in the rights and privileges it accords in this direction. In the five universities Basel, Bern, Geneva, Lausanne and Zürich, women are admitted on a perfect equality with men, while in the sixth and last university, that at Freiburg, they are admitted to all the faculties as "hearers." Recently published official reports bring the surprising intelligence that of the total attendance at the Swiss universities nearly one-fourth are women, namely of a total 4611 immatriculated and non-immatriculated students 1026 are women. Of these 624 are immatriculated and candidates for degrees, while 402 are "hearers." Of the former class 547 are from abroad. Of the foreigners 371 or 68 per cent. are in the medical department, 114 in the philosophical, 54 are studying the Natural Sciences, 8 law, while of the native women more than one half are in the philosophical department, the medicals coming next with 26. As has been the case all along Russia sends the largest contingent of immatriculated women students, namely about two thirds, or 422, and of these again 326 are students of medicine. Taking both classes together, numerically the nations are represented as follows: Russia, 458; Switzerland, 175; Germany, 86; England, 124; Bulgaria, 22; America, 20; Austro-Hungary, 19; France, 7; Rumania, 7; Denmark, 6; Servia, 5; Holland, 4; Italy, 4; Sweden, 3; Norway and Spain, each 1.

It is interesting in this connection to note that there seems to be but little danger of the professional women crowding out the men. The latest reports state that in Berlin there are only three women physicians, and the government reports of Switzerland, where for 26 years the profession and practice of medicine has been open to women, state that there are only 26 women doctors in the whole country over against more than 2000 male physicians.

# MODEL SERMONS. SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, \$2.50; half leather, \$3.00; half morocco, \$4.00;  
Imitation morocco, two volumes, \$4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

By DR. C. H. L. SCHUETTE.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship with understanding; and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, \$1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five. "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## THE MEANS OF GRACE

BY REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

**T**HIS Magazine is designed to supply the want of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim is the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers, 35 cents.

All remittances should be addressed to LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, Columbus, Ohio. All communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges to PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., Columbus, Ohio.

---

"The Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28

# THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

IN ITS FOUNDATION, ESSENCE, APPEARANCE AND WORK

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Prompted by the purest motive, the desire to serve his Master by being helpful to his fellow-laborers, fully conscious that the unscriptural views on the subject endangered the soul and should be exposed, and confident "that the King will accompany it with His blessing," the author wrote and published this work.

"This work is notable for its comprehensive and yet simple analysis of its subject, and for its earnest devotion to the practical topics and problems that spring out of the Church life at every point." — *Lutheran Church Review*.

"The work is carefully prepared and well written." — *Lutheran Observer*.

The book contains 364 pages and sells for \$1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

No Theological Library Complete Without It.

# THE ERROR OF MODERN MISSOURI

ITS INCEPTION, DEVELOPMENT, AND REFUTATION,

AS SET FORTH IN

- I. The Present Controversy on Predestination; A Contribution to its History and Proper Estimate. By F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.
- II. "Intuitu Fidei." By REV. F. A. SCHMIDT, D. D.
- III. A Testimony Against the False Doctrine of Predestination Recently Introduced by the Missouri Synod. By Several Former Members of the Missouri Synod.

EDITED BY GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

The subject matter discussed in these several treatises is vast and varied. Dr. C. H. L. Schuette, President of Ev. Luth. Synod, has the following to say with reference to the book: "Suffice it to say that the erudition, assiduity and conscientiousness of the authors, and of the translators as well, are the best guarantee any one can ask for that the book herewith recommended is a treasury of profound thought, nice reasoning and of rich information. May it find its way into the hands of many readers and prove itself of lasting good to them and through them to the Church at large."

The book contains 800 large octavo pages and sells for \$2.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL  
DEVOTED TO THE INTER-  
ESTS OF THE EVANGELI-  
CAL LUTHERAN CHURCH

*Edited by the Theological Faculty of Capital University*

VOL. XX

AUGUST 1900

No. 4

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. Briefly explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D. . . . .	193
THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE. By Prof. E. Pfeiffer, A. M. . . . .	205
ELOCUTION FOR PREACHERS OR PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Rev. E. G. Tressel, A. M. . . . .	224
WHAT GREAT MEN THINK OF THE BIBLE . . . . .	220
PRISCA THE AUTHOR OF HEBREWS . . . . .	254
NOTES . . . . .	255

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN

55-57-59 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, OHIO

# THE TEACHERS' ANNUAL

FOR THE YEAR 1900.

The Sunday School Lessons for the whole year explained in language within the grasp of every teacher. The author's object is to make the text of the lessons plain. A faithful use of the "Annual" will richly repay anyone, whether teacher or not.

Price, in substantial board binding, per copy, 75 cents. In lots of six or more, 60 cents per copy, payable in advance. Postage 7 cents extra.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY DR. F. W. STELLHORN,

Professor of Theology in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

A popular treatise on the four Gospels. For study and devotion. Gives the meaning of the text, the history of prominent persons mentioned in the gospels, the topography, all in a clear and distinct manner. The highest praise has been bestowed upon this Commentary by able and competent critics.

Plain Cloth, \$2.00; Half Leather, \$3.50; Morocco, \$3.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY

OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

BY HEINRICH SCHMID, D. D.

A TEXT-BOOK. The Lutheran Doctrine in a clear, distinct and comprehensive form.

Bound Durably in Elegant Cloth, \$4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIES

Pastors and Teachers and Professors will find it to their advantage to consult the general Catalogue of the Lutheran Book Concern before purchasing what they need for their libraries. It cannot be expected that all the books mentioned could be kept constantly on hand, but the assurance can be given that all orders will be promptly attended to.

---

## CHURCH RECORDS

Every congregation should keep a complete record of all the pastoral acts and other important events occurring in the congregation. To this end *Church Records* are a necessity. The LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN has them for sale at \$3.75.

---

**ALL IN ONE VOLUME** are the works of able and competent authors on Theological and Practical Subjects, covering a large field. We have bound volumes of the COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, from 2 to 19, bound durably in half roan at \$2.00 per volume. Order complete set and we will furnish same at \$1.50 per volume.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XX.

AUGUST, 1900.

No. 4.

## THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D.D.,  
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

THE DUTY OF CHRISTIANS IN MATTERS NOT BINDING ON  
THE CONSCIENCE: Ch. xiv, 1-xv. 13.

### CHAPTER XIV.

#### A. *The Correct Principle and its Application especially to the Conduct of the Weak in Faith: Vv. 1-12.*

A man that has the right faith, but is still weak in this faith so that he does not draw all the practical consequences of this faith and out of fear of losing his salvation anxiously refrains from things, or does things, that in themselves have no relation whatever to salvation, such a man should be received as a brother and treated tenderly so that his scruples and timid thoughts are not judged harshly (1). This rule, applicable to all times, the Apostle regards

V. 1. *Δέ* here simply indicates the transition to a new point: "furthermore". *Τῷ πιστεῖ*: dat. of reference: him that is weak with regard to faith. "Receive": take unto yourselves, do not withdraw from him as not worthy of your company. "Not to judgment of thoughts": such judgments are not to be the result of our conduct over against the weak brethren and will not be the result if we "receive" them in the true spirit. *Διάκρισις* means discernment, judgment in the other two passages of the New Testament where it occurs (1 Cor. 12, 10; Hebr. 5, 14); and this signification is suitable also here. The meaning "doubt" cannot be proven, though the verb *διακρίνομαι* is as a rule used in this sense in the New Testament, e. g., verse 23. Otherwise the translation "not unto doubts of thoughts" -- so as not to call forth in the

especially necessary for his days when men entered the Christian Church that formerly, as Jews, or also as heathens, had entertained ideas of abstinence and asceticism that had no warrant in the Gospel. For some of these it was no easy thing to free themselves entirely from these long cherished and practised notions, and without regarding the observance of them as exactly necessary to justification and salvation for themselves or others, they had not the courage and strength of faith to omit it altogether. So in one and the same congregation there might be some that had a faith strong enough to eat everything, whilst there were perhaps others that in their weakness of faith ate only vegetable food, and no meat (2). The danger in such a condition was for the strong in faith to despise the weak because of their weakness, and for the weak to judge the strong as devoid of the proper earnestness and conscientiousness; and that was just what was not to be done, since God has admitted all that believe in Christ to His communion and treats them as His children. And this example set by God Himself should be followed by every Christian. That is the general rule with regard to this matter (3). The Apostle now, in the first place, applies it to the weak in faith that are apt to judge the strong. They ought to consider that they have no business and right whatever to judge a man that by true faith in Christ is a servant of God, in a matter that is not binding on the

weak brother doubtful thoughts, namely, as to whether he was doing right or not (comp. verse 23), would also be fitting the context. The rendering, "doubtful disputations", is itself very doubtful.

V. 2. ὅς μὲν should be followed by ὃς δέ (comp verse 5); instead the definite expression ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν is used. Πιστεύει: has faith, confidence (strong enough) to eat everything; has no conscientious scruples. This translation is more in accordance with πιστεύει in verse 1 than the other grammatically also possible, viz., believes that he may eat everything. "Eats herbs, or vegetables", namely, only these, and no meat. Thus he went even beyond the ceremonial law of the Old Testament that prohibited only certain kinds of meat (Lev. 11).

V. 3. "For God has received him"; though in itself applicable to both classes, this is here predicated of the second only, since αὐτόν refers to τὸν ἐσθίουντα, as also verse 4 shows. The last clause of verse 3 forms the transition from the general rule laid down in the first part of this verse to the application made to the conduct of the weak in the following verses 4-12.

conscience because it is neither commanded nor forbidden by God, as if his attitude in that had anything to do with his relation to God. This does not concern them at all, but only God; and He can and will see to it that a true and faithful servant will remain in Christian faith and life notwithstanding the full use of his Christian liberty in such matters of religious and moral indifference (4).

But not only with regard to meat did that different attitude manifest itself in the first Christian Church, but also with regard to days chosen for fasting and the like: some would prefer certain days, perhaps those that were used for that purpose during the times of the Old Testament, whilst others would make no distinction. Here the same rule is to be observed: everything depends upon the condition of the heart. If a man has true faith and is convinced that what he does is right, he can do in those matters what according to the circumstances seems best to him (5). For whatever he does, whether he makes a

---

V. 4. "Thou, who art thou" (comp. 9, 20): emphasizes the presumptuousness and arrogance of such a person. *Θιζέτης* is a *δοῦλος* that serves as a domestic; a house-servant. To undertake to judge such a servant of another one, who stands in the most intimate relation to his master, is the height of presumption. "To his own lord": not to thee; it is not thy business to judge concerning that. "He stands": remains in the position of a true Christian, a faithful servant of Christ; "he falls": does not remain in that position, falls away from it, loses it. Which of the two is the case that is for the Master, Christ, to determine, and for nobody else. "And he will be made to stand": such an indifferent thing in itself will not bring about his fall, provided he remains in true faith, which he can do notwithstanding his making full use of his Christian liberty, though, of course, only by the power and grace of his Master who can, and will, preserve him from the dangers that beset his peculiar condition.

V. 5. *Γάρ* being omitted by most copies, a second point of controversy is introduced, which, however, is treated briefly, as probably not of so great an importance just then and there and to be decided in accordance with the rules laid down for the first and principal one. *Κρίνει*: "he decides in favor of a day against another day" = he prefers one day to another. "Another decides in favor of every day" = gives preference to none, esteems every day alike. The general expression used here does not justify the exemption of any day in any respect; hence the observance of Sunday as well as that of the Old Testament Sabbath is in itself a matter of Christian liberty, a liberty limited only by the com-



distinction between days and meats, or not, he does it in the service of his Lord and Savior, to whom he also gives thanks for whatever he receives and uses; hence his personal relation to Christ is not changed at all, whatever course he may pursue, in external matters of this kind (6). For to Christ's service and honor a Christian is devoted both in life and death, these greatest extremes in the existence of man (7): Christ we serve, Christ's we are, whether we live or die (8). For that was the very purpose of Christ's

---

mandment of order (1 Cor. 14, 40) and love (verses 13 sqq.). Comp. Col. 2, 16 sq. "Fully assured in his own mind": it concerns only him; but he must be entirely sure that he is doing right, so as not to sin against his conscience (vv. 14, 20, 23).

V. 6. Ὁ φρονῶν: he that is concerned about, observes, the day, i. e., the day that he prefers and selects. Κυρίῳ φρονεῖ: unto the Lord (Christ) he observes it, in His service, to His honor; not in the service and to the honor of anyone else. Thus he is and remains a Christian in what he does. The same holds good with regard to his eating or not eating certain food; for he even proves himself to be a true Christian by giving thanks to God for what he may eat, whether it be herbs only or also meat (comp. verse 2). Κυρίῳ without the article is used as a proper noun, there being only one in this sense; the dative is that of interest: in the interest, service, of the Lord. "And he that eateth not" (certain food), "unto the Lord he eateth not": his not eating, avoiding some food, takes place in the service of the Lord. "He giveth God thanks": before partaking of the food that he eats (comp. Matt. 15, 36; 26, 26; Acts 27, 35; 1 Cor. 10, 30; 11, 24; 1. Tim. 4, 4).

V. 7. Whatever a true Christian does, in whatever condition he is, his object and purpose is not to serve and honor himself. If not even dying, the very opposite of life, forms an exception to this, certainly eating, or not eating, certain food will not change the personal relation between Christ and the believer, by virtue of which the latter does everything in the service and to the honor of the former.

V. 8. Ἐάν τε . . . ἐάν τε: whether on the one hand . . . or on the other hand. This verse adds the affirmative statement to the negative of the preceding verse and thus proves the latter. "Unto the Lord" and "the Lord's" have the emphatic position, over against "unto himself" in the preceding verse. Because we are the Lord's, not only objectively, but also subjectively, being conscious and glad of it and conducting ourselves accordingly, we do everything in His service and to His honor. Our doing the latter is the proof, because the natural result, of our being the former

glorious redemption that not even death should be able to separate from Him those that are His in true faith (9). But if our relation to Christ remains the same whether we live or die, it will certainly remain the same whether we eat, or do not eat, a certain food, whether we choose certain days for fasting, or omit doing so. In fact, nothing that leaves unchanged the condition of our heart can affect our relation to Christ and our standing in His Church. In matters indifferent, neither commanded nor forbidden in the Word of God, we can be and remain Christ's whether we take the one course possible or the other, as long as faith and its inseparable companion, charity, are not violated. But it is a violation of brotherly love, and at the same time presumptuous, to judge or despise our fellow-Christians for not taking in those matters the same course that we take. On the last day there will take place a universal judgment (10) when every man will have to wor-

(οὕτως: therefore). We die unto the Lord, in His service and to His honor, not only when we die for His sake, as the martyrs did, but also when we die as His children, content to leave this world and glad to come to Him, commending everything to Him.

V. 9. The objective cause of the subjective condition described in verses 7 and 8. This verse also proves that the "Lord" spoken of in the preceding verses is Christ. The life of Christ is that following His death. He is our Lord because through death He entered life and thus gloriously carried out and crowned His redemptive work. Both His vicarious death and His not remaining in death were necessary to make Him our Savior and Lord (4, 25; 1 Cor. 15, 14 sqq.). *Ἐζησεν*: became living (the inceptive aorist).

V. 10. "Thou": emphatic in both clauses, denoting the arrogant assumption of a right that is in direct opposition to the lordship of Christ. The first "thou" is addressed to the weak in faith, the second to the strong (comp. verse 3). "But": over against what has been set forth; "or also": also this is presumptuous and a disregard of Christ's prerogative, though this case has not been spoken of in the immediately preceding verses and is mentioned here only for the sake of completeness. "Thy brother": hence acting thus is most uncharitable, a violation of brotherly love. "For": it is presumptuous to anticipate the decision of the only legitimate and competent judge, and at the same time dangerous thereby to render ourselves obnoxious to His condemnatory judgment. "Of God": that God will judge by Christ is here taken for granted (comp. 2, 16; Acts 10, 42; 17, 31; John 5, 22. 27).

ship and confess God as the supreme Judge (11). Since then everyone of us will have to give an account of himself we certainly should be careful with regard to what we ourselves are doing, and leave to God the judgment of our brother in so far as he does not evidently commit a sin (12).

B. *The Application especially to the Conduct of the Strong.* Vv. 13-23.

Since all of us once will be judged by God Himself, the Apostle admonishes his readers to do no more what no doubt now and then had taken place among them, namely, judging one another, since also despising the other because of his weakness includes a judgment. They should rather come to this decision and determination not to do anything that might destroy, or at least weaken still more, a weak

Christ's judgment-seat is that of God, and the *divine* judgment is to be emphasized.

V. 11. A free citation from Isa. 45, 23. "I live": a Hebraism, not taken from the passage cited, but a reminiscence of similar expressions (e. g., Numb. 14, 21, 28) = as surely as I live — a most solemn declaration, in fact an oath. "ὅτι": "that"; "I live" being equivalent to "I swear by myself." "To me": emphatic. "Every knee shall bow": everyone shall humbly and submissively acknowledge me his Lord. Ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ: shall praise God. This verb construed with the dative always has this signification in the New Testament, as also in the Septuagint translation (comp. e. g., 15, 9; Matt. 11, 25); the meaning to confess it has only when construed with the accusative (e. g., Matt. 3, 6; James 5, 16). Whether this homage and praise will be voluntary on the part of all, is not stated and makes no difference as to the conclusiveness of the argument (comp. Phil. 2, 10 sq.). This prophecy of Isaiah, referring to the times of the New Testament in general, will be completely fulfilled on the great judgment day only, when every man without exception will, either willingly or unwillingly, have to acknowledge and recognize the true God, as revealed in Christ, and thereby praise Him.

V. 12. "So then": an impressive summary of the last clause of verse 10 and of verse 11. "Each one of us" has the main emphasis, corresponding to "all", "every knee", and "every tongue" in the preceding verses; "concerning himself", by its position, is, however, not without emphasis. Thus then our brother, as we ourselves, will certainly be judged, and this by the most competent judge; and every one will have to answer for himself. Why then should we regard it our business to judge our brother except where God has already clearly pronounced judgment by His Word?

brother's faith and thus sever, or at least loosen, his connection with Christ. And thus Paul now mainly addresses the strong Christians and shows them what their conduct toward their weak brethren ought to be (13). In his intimate connection with Christ the Apostle has the firm conviction that in itself no food, meat for example, is incompatible with the holiness of a child of God; but if a person regard it as incompatible he must avoid it as long as he is of this opinion, or his faith will suffer. For using it would be to act contrary to his conscience; and our conscience must be obeyed under all circumstances, even if it should be wrong, since to disobey our conscience is to do what we regard as contrary to the will of God and hence is equivalent to saying that we do not care about the will of God, which is subversive of faith. A conscience that is wrong simply acts upon wrong information, since the only office of conscience in its strict sense is to admonish us to do what we regard to be right, and to judge us according to our obedience or disobedience to this admonition; hence a wrong conscience must be better informed, not be disobeyed

---

V. 13. "Therefore": since matters are as stated. "One another": the weak, the strong, and reversely. "Let us": the Apostle includes himself, making the admonition milder in form and thereby more acceptable. *Κρίνωμεν . . . κρίνατε*: a rhetorical repetition of the same word in a modified sense: "but this judge rather" = let this be your judgment, your maxim and rule with regard to this point (comp. 1 Cor. 2, 2; 7, 37). *Τό* before the infinitive makes it a noun, an explanatory opposition to *τοῦτο* (comp. the same expression in connection with the same verb having the same signification 2 Cor. 2, 1). "Not to put a stumbling-block for your brother or an offense": this shows that the Apostle now passes over to the conduct of the strong in faith who, by making free use of their Christian liberty, might cause their weak brethren to do something that would still be against their conscience and thus to sin. *Πρόσχομμα*, from *πρὸςζόπτω*: to strike (the foot) against and hence to stumble, denotes a stumbling-block, an occasion or cause of falling; *σζάνδαλον* in its original sense is a trap-stick, on which the bait is placed, a trap or snare, and then also denotes an offense, i. e., a cause of error and sin. The two expressions mean the same thing and by their connection emphasize the idea. "For your brother" (dat. incommodi): to his injury, causing him to stumble and fall in his relation to Christ; and this would be so much greater a sin since he is your brother whom you rather ought to help along on his way to heaven in every way possible.

(14). This should well be remembered; for if I am so selfish as not to give up food that my brother in his weakness regards as to be avoided, and thus induce him to follow my example, hurting his own conscience and plunging himself into painful struggles, I certainly can no more say that I am acting in accordance with brotherly love. If we really are followers of Christ we shall surely be careful not to become, by the uncharitable use of such an unimportant thing as a special kind of food, the cause of the eternal ruin of a fellow-man for whom Christ also gave His life on the cross in order that he might be saved eternally (15). So then we should be on our guard lest by our uncharitable conduct in these matters we be the cause that even outsiders speak reproachfully of the treasure of a Christian, as if after all it consisted in external, paltry things. (16). For eating

V. 14. This verse shows that the Apostle, as far as the principle is concerned, sides with the strong in faith. So much more weight his admonition addressed to them ought to have with them. Paul's knowledge is a conviction that has its foundation in his intimate union with Christ whose blessed servant he is. *Κοινόν*: common, unclean, profane, hence incompatible with the sanctity of a Christian (comp. Acts 10, 14, 28). *Εἰ μὴ*: except; *οὐδὲν κοινόν* (without *δι' ἑαυτοῦ*: through itself, in its nature) must be repeated before this expression. "To him": emphatic; to no one else. The uncleanness is merely subjective and imaginary, caused by the wrong opinion on which the conscience acts.

V. 15. "For": since verse 14 on account of its importance cannot well be considered parenthetical so that verse 15 would furnish the reason and proof for verse 13, a sentence must be supplied like "And this must be observed and heeded", namely, that a wrong conscience must still be obeyed and spared; or, "I have reason to remind you of this", namely, what is stated in the latter part of verse 14. "On account of food" (*διὰ* c. acc., not gen.) and "by thy food" are emphatic, showing how small a thing it is, and how selfish and uncharitable not to abstain from it for the sake of a "brother" for whom we ought to be ready to do anything. To "grieve" a "brother" is certainly not an act of "love", and brotherly love is the mark and characteristic of a Christian (John 13, 35; 1 John 4, 20). "No longer": presupposing that, as a sincere Christian, thou hast done so hitherto. "For whom Christ died": Christ gave up His *life* for him; a follower of Christ ought surely to be willing to give up some kind of *food* for him. Comp. 1 Cor. 8, 11 sq.

V. 16. "Let not be spoken abusively or evil, of": the strong expression shows that not the weak Christians, but those that are

and drinking this or that, or anything of that nature, does not make a man a member of the kingdom of God; what makes him such is the righteousness obtained by Christ and appropriated by faith, and as a consequence peace with God (5, 1) and in afflictions heavenly joy wrought by the Holy Ghost (17). Whoever in such a life is a faithful servant of His divine Lord and Savior, is sure of the pleasure of God, and all reasonable men will approve of his conduct as being in conformity with his confession (18).

outside of the Christian Church, are alluded to. "Therefore": since uncharitable conduct can have such a dire effect, bring about the eternal ruin of a fellow Christian, reason to speak evil of Christianity is given unbelievers. "Your good": the good that emphatically and distinctively is yours; "a very comprehensive expression: all which is good belonging to a Christian, in distinction from a man who is not a Christian" (BOISE). It is not necessary to specify, since everything that a Christian possesses and enjoys is meant by the general expression.

V. 17. "The kingdom of God": that institution which contains all the good that a Christian possesses and enjoys; or, "that dominion of God or that order of things in which the authority of His will, especially the realization of His counsel of salvation, becomes apparent" (CREMER). In its perfect state it is still a thing of the future (comp. 1 Cor. 6, 9 sq.; 15, 50; Gal. 5, 21); the preparatory stage is the Christian Church here on earth with its means of grace containing all that Christ has procured for man's salvation (Col. 1, 13; 1 Cor. 4, 20). In the present verse evidently the latter signification obtains: the essence of this kingdom, that which constitutes it, "is not eating and drinking" this or that (*βρῶσις* and *πόσις* in the first place denote the act of eating and drinking, not that which is eaten or drunk, for which *βρῶμα* [verses 15, 20] and *πόμα* [1 Cor. 10, 4] are the distinctive expressions). "Righteousness and peace" cannot here mean *moral qualities* manifested by a Christian in his relation to his fellow-men; for then love would certainly not be omitted, and "joy in the Holy Ghost" is a *gift*, not a virtue, flowing from the likewise divine gifts of righteousness and peace (comp. 1 Thess 1, 6). Thus what constitutes the kingdom of God, makes a person a member of it, is not any external action or activity of man, but gifts of divine grace that simply must be accepted and appropriated by God-wrought faith. "Joy in the Holy Ghost" is joy having its basis and source in Him and His gracious operation (comp. Gal. 5, 22).

V. 18. "For": that which makes a man pleasing to God is certainly that which makes him a member of the kingdom of God; external things, like eating and drinking, cannot do the former

Hence we should avoid dissensions and quarrels about those external matters, and so order our lives that peace and mutual edification, constant furtherance of all in faith and love and hope, may be attained (19). This certainly is not the case when for the sake of such a small matter as a special kind of food we do not dread to destroy the noblest work of God, a Christian, by inducing him to act against his conscience. For though in itself every kind of food can be used by a Christian without any detriment to his inner life, still it is hurtful to him if he eats it to the offense of his

and therefore can neither do the latter. Hence verse 18 proves the correctness of verse 17. "Herein": in the condition and life described in the second part of verse 17, in the true nature of the kingdom of God. Grammatically ἐν τούτῳ can be referred to ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, and being in Him is certainly the condition and prerequisite of serving Christ; but then ἐν πν. ἀγ. in verse 17 would have to be construed not simply with χάρις but also with δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη, which construction makes good sense but is without example in the New Testament. Hence the explanation given above is the most natural and probable. To "serve Christ", and to do this in the right manner and spirit, is an absolutely necessary, and the only necessary, condition of pleasing God and being a member of His kingdom. "Approved of men": accepted and regarded by them as a sincere Christian — the normal condition with fair-minded men, the general rule (hence the article before "men").

V. 19. "So then": a conclusion drawn from verse 17 as proved by verse 18. "The things that belong to peace": what constitutes, brings about, and preserves peace. "Peace" in this connection evidently has not the same meaning as in verse 17, but denotes harmony and concord among men. The connection determines the signification of a word. "Let us pursue": διώκωμεν, the reading preferred by most commentators as best fitting the train of thought which would seem to require an admonition; but the reading διώχομεν: "we pursue, strive after" is better attested and makes good sense, stating what true Christians accordingly do. "The things that belong to the edification, the (edification that is directed) towards each other": whatever constitutes, brings about, and promotes mutual edification. "Edification", meaning literally the building of a house, is a figurative expression denoting the act of furthering a man in his state and condition of a Christian (comp. 2 Cor. 10, 8; 13, 10; — 1 Cor. 14, 4; 1 Thess. 5, 11). Thus the Christian is considered a spiritual building which is not completed before his death. The whole Christian Church is also regarded as such a spiritual building (1 Cor. 3, 10 sqq.; Eph. 2, 20 sqq.).

conscience (20; comp. 14). Hence, the correct thing for a stronger Christian to do is not to eat, or drink, or do anything that gives offense to a weaker brother and may lead him to act against his conscience by imitating the example of the stronger Christian without having his faith and knowledge (21; comp. 13). If a Christian is strong in faith, let him have and use it in his individual relation to God, but not boastingly and uncharitably in relation to his

V. 20. "On account of food": emphatic position (comp. verse 15). *Κατάλυε*: pull down, destroy (comp. Matt. 26, 61; Gal. 2, 18); "the work of God": that which God Himself has made, has built. The Apostle retains the figure used in the preceding verse, but turns it into a somewhat different direction: in verse 19 men, Christians, are regarded as builders, building up the spiritual life of their fellow Christian; in our present verse God is represented as the builder who has made the Christian what he is, a spiritual temple in which the Spirit of God, and with Him the whole Trinity, dwells. Some, referring to verse 19, understand "the work of God" to mean the Christian's life and character implanted in him by God, which would amount to the same, since the inner life makes a man a Christian. *Καθαρά*: clean, the opposite of *κοινόν* (verse 14). *Ἀλλά*: stronger than *δέ*. *Ἰσχύον*: evil, sinful, presents the subjective, ethical side of *κοινόν*; the subject to be supplied from *πάντα*: *πάν*. *Διὰ προσχόματος*: in, with, under, offence (comp. 2, 27). Eating with offense could be said of the strong in faith who would eat to the offense of others, viz. the weak; but to refer it to the weak who eats to his own offense better suits the context and accords with verse 14: "all things are clean" = "nothing is unclean of itself"; hence also "it is evil for that man who eateth with offense" = "save that to him who accounteth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean." Comp. 1 Cor. 8, 9 sqq.

V. 21. *Καλόν*: proper, praiseworthy (comp. 1 Cor. 7, 1). *Τό* makes the following infinitives (with which *μή* is the regular negation), together with their objects, nouns; after *μηδέ* supply *ποιεῖν τοῦτο* (or *τι*). *Ἐν ᾧ*: wherein. "Stumbles": good manuscripts add "or is offended or is weak" (*ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ*), which reading, if genuine, would by the synonymous expressions simply emphasize the sad idea. In our opinion the addition by a scribe who wanted to explain, in the margin, the first expression by the two others, is more probable than the omission, if in the original text; the marginal note was then by mistake incorporated with the text. "Nor to drink wine": hence drinking wine was also, on account of conscientious scruples, avoided by weak in the faith. Comp. 1 Cor. 8, 13.



weak brother. For he who is entirely sure of the correctness of what he chooses to do is, indeed, happy in his strong faith (22); but he who is in doubt whether he may eat a certain food and still eats it, by this very act condemns himself, because it is not warranted by his faith and therefore is contrary to his conscience; and whatever is of this nature is manifestly sin (23; comp. 14).

V. 22. "Thou": emphatic appeal to the strong. *Πίστιν ἦν ἔχεις*: an altogether unusual construction; either the article should be before *πίστιν* or this word should be placed after *ἔχεις*, in which position the article, being replaced by the relative clause, is omitted. Some editors, on this account, omit *ἦν*, but against the authority of the best manuscripts, and then take *σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις* either as a concessive or as an interrogative clause (comp. 13, 3): "thou hast faith" (I concede that, but); or, "hast thou faith?" *Κατὰ σεαυτόν*: with regard to thyself, for thyself, to thyself; "before God": the searcher of hearts, who needs no external demonstration and will appreciate thy strong faith. "Happy": having a strong faith and an untroubled conscience without it. "Who does not judge himself": so sure he is of the correctness of his action that he does not need to investigate and then pass judgment. "In what he approves": in what he chooses to do.

V. 23. *Διακρινόμενος* (note the climax *κρίνων* [verse 22], *διακρινόμενος*, and *καταέχριται*): who is at variance with himself, wavers, hesitates, doubts. "If he have eaten" (subjunctive of the aorist) "he is condemned"; as soon he has eaten, by the very fact of having eaten, he is in the position of one who is condemned, proven a grievous sinner (Perfect). "Because not of faith": supply, "he has eaten" (*ἔφαγεν*). His faith, being weak (comp. verse 1), cannot be the source (*ἐκ*) from which his eating has proceeded; the eating is rather contrary to his (weak) faith. "But everything that is not of faith is sin": this means, in this connection, that any and every action of man of which he is not convinced that it is in conformity with the will of God is sinful. "Faith is also here not directly the faith that justifies and saves, but the confidence, having its origin in it, that every action that proceeds from it and consists with it is in accordance with the will of God. Hence the expression of Augustine, 'The whole life of unbelievers is sin,' has its foundation in our passage not directly, indeed, but nevertheless indirectly. For if every action that does not proceed from the confidence of its being in accordance with the will of God is sin, and if such confidence can only be a result of evangelical saving faith, the necessary conclusion is that every action is sin that has not for its ultimate source and origin this evangelical saving faith." (PHILIPPI.)

## THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

LECTURE DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY, BY PROFESSOR E. PFEIFFER, A. M., COLUMBUS, O,

The character of my daily work and studies determined the selection of the subject of this lecture or talk. The presentation of some phase or epoch of church history, and thought, would lie within the scope of my employment in the seminary and would not divert from its proper channel a particle of the energy which I owe and must needs give to my new office. And I trust that what, in research and meditation, has been of thrilling interest and much profit to me will, in the narrative and application, not be without interest and profit to you.

But it is such an old thing—this theme,—so far from being fresh and up-to-date, thoroughly antiquated, having about it the musty smell of the middle ages. Nay, my friend, more disagreeable still, if it is a pleasant odor you are hankering after. This ancient theme surrounds the student of history with the overpowering, sickening odor of burning flesh, and that flesh human, the earthly tenement of an immortal soul struggling for light and life and liberty. And this struggle, whether ancient or modern, wherever it has taken place, among any race or nation, whether among Albigenes and Hussites of former ages or on the part of American or Boer patriots of the present age, this grappling with usurped authority, this revulsion against tyrann/, this longing for liberty of thought and action, this struggle to be free strikes a responsive chord in the heart of every one who values life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We have all carried up from our childhood days some notion of the Dark Ages. In many minds doubtless it is a very vague notion, an uncertain quantity, a general idea of chaos and darkness preceding the organization and enlightenment of the Reformation era. I think it affords a truer idea of the Dark Ages to regard them as a time of tremendous conflict. The history of mankind proves that it is just as impossible to enslave men permanently as it is to keep steam or liquid air hermetically sealed. The greater the tyranny or pressure from without, the greater the tension or resistance from within, and the more violent and destructive the final and inevitable explosion.

I. In tracing the conditions and events preceding and leading up to the Council of Constance, and in order to

understand the merits and achievements of that august and impotent assemblage, due regard must be had for the reformatory efforts that were made in diverse places and in numberless forms throughout the middle ages. They were so many lightning flashes blazing out in the night, only to make the remaining darkness seem blacker. They were mutterings of impending storms that ever and anon swept down upon society in fearful desolation. They were the repeated outbreaks of the struggle of enslaved souls in the face of stupendous odds and tremendous forces. The land of our fathers was the main battle-ground and storm-center. Ever since the days of Charlemagne and his laudable efforts for the promotion of scientific pursuits and popular education the Christian spirit of the German nation had been wrestling with the spirit of statesmanship and autocracy that continued to haunt and would not quit the city of the Seven Hills and struggling towards the state of independence and majority which it finally attained in the Church of the Reformation.

These reformatory efforts were in the nature of spasmodic reactions against conditions of moral corruption and spiritual tyranny that had become intolerable. They arose and operated partly within the Church which they sought to reform from within and where they were tolerated, and partly in direct opposition and more or less violent antagonism to the established hierarchy, which in turn, by fire and sword, by intrigue and treachery, by ban and interdict, continued with growing skill to practice the art of exterminating the heretics and enlarging the sphere and power of its own dominion. Some of these reactionary movements ran into the wildest excess of fanaticism and heresy, as those of various sects known by the name of the Cathari, while other protesting and dissenting parties, notably the Waldenses, developed a sober, evangelical character. There were revolutionary reformers like Peter of Bruys who advocated the destruction of churches, and Arnold of Brescia, who boldly attacked the worldliness of the church and the papacy, and in Rome led the agitation for political and ecclesiastical freedom.

Sometimes the term Renaissance, the "new birth," the revival of learning and intellectual activity, is used in a wide sense to designate the prolonged struggle of individualism against the autocratic power of church and state, or, as we may also call it, the contention for the right of private judgment. Lordly and despotic principles were fostered and cultivated and so far as possible, applied both

by the church and by the state. The church maintained the principle by seeking to control and lord it over the conscience and religious life of men, while the state aimed to exercise an equally lordly paternalism over its subjects in all their secular and civil relations. The revolt of the human mind against this presumptuous regency of despots was most active during the four centuries between 1100 and 1500. The first great scholar to declare the principle of individual rights and defend their claims was Abelard (1079-1142) of Paris, who, pursuing a decidedly skeptical tendency in theology, did not hesitate to discuss and condemn many things done under the claim of the church's authority. Other scholars and philosophers, following in his footsteps, boldly avowed and maintained the principle of individualism. It was naturally fostered in the universities that began to spring into existence toward the end of the 12th century. Among the earliest and most influential were those of Paris, Oxford and Bologna. By the end of the 14th century 46 universities had been founded. Though a large part of the learning which issued from these universities was unfruitful and yielded little real benefit to mankind, they tended to dissipate the darkness of ignorance and superstition and wielded a liberalizing influence in general. The theological science and intellectual activity of the middle ages reached its highest stage of development in the 13th century, whose chronicles are made luminous by a series of distinguished Dominican and Franciscan scholars, among them Alexander of Hales and Roger Bacon of Oxford, Albertus Magnus of Cologne, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus.

In order to properly judge and appreciate the Council of Constance in its heroic aims and feeble results we must take a rapid survey of the development of the papacy as the dominant factor in the case. With reference to the divergent and contradictory character of the three or four hundred pontiffs who during a course of fifteen hundred years have successively sat in the reputed chair of St. Peter, Dr. John Lord (*Beacon Lights of History* Vol. 2, p. 141 f.) says: "There never were greater geniuses or greater fools; saints of almost preternatural sanctity, like the first Leo and Gregory, or hounds like Boniface VIII. or Alexander VI.; an array of scholars and dunces, ascetics and gluttons, men who adorned and men who scandalized their lofty position." One of the greatest and most famous of the popes was Gregory VII., perhaps better known by the name of Hildebrand, before whose arrogant and unflinching demands the Franconian monarch, Henry IV., bowed in abject sub-

mission at Canossa. The autocratic aspirations of Leo I. and Gregory I. were by Hildebrand developed into the idea of a universal theocracy, whose visible head should be the pope at Rome as Christ's viceroy on earth. Temporal states and governments should be members of this theocratic system, and temporal princes and sovereigns should bear allegiance to the supreme pontiff. Hildebrand showed his strength of character in effecting notable reforms in the church and among the corrupt clergy and profligate monks, but when he died in exile he lamented that his scheme of government had not been realized. A century after him Innocent III. entered into his labors and reaped the fruits of his sowing. Innocent succeeded in gaining what Gregory had sought:—"independent sovereignty, control over the princes of the earth, and the supremacy of the Church." In point of power and despotism the papacy had reached its height. The pontificate of Innocent was distinguished for its bold and successful assumption and assertion of authority over all temporal states and all the relations of life, and of this there was a magnificent and imposing exhibition at its close. The pope convened the Fourth Lateran Council (1215)—it was the so-called 12th Ecumenic Ch. Council—and there were assembled the representatives of two emperors, all the eastern patriarchs, in person or by proxy, 70 primates or metropolitans, more than 400 bishops and 800 other prelates,—Church and state, acknowledging the pope as their head, receiving the law from his lips, and bowing in unquestioning submission to his supreme authority. Looking back upon these events and conditions from our time and point of view, it seems marvelous that for nearly a century the papacy was able to maintain itself upon the proud heights to which Innocent III. had raised it. To have permanently realized his ideas and ideals would have required, as archbishop Trench has said, "nothing less than omnipotence, and this wielded by omniscience." In the absence of these it remains "the grandest and most magnificent failure in human history."

With the pontificate of Boniface VIII. (1294-1303) the papacy began to lose its autocratic power and glory. The French court—King and parliament—resented and protested against the papal pretensions and encroachments, and then followed in rapid succession the so-called "Babylonish Captivity," the Great Schism of the West, the three Reforming Councils,—and all these other events working together to constitute the dawn of the Great Reformation.

Through the powerful influence of the French government the seat of the papacy was transferred from Rome to Avignon, where seven popes resided for a period of nearly 70 years, in servile dependence on a foreign power. The papal court at Avignon was characterized by growing laxity of morals and religious frivolity. Its example of profligacy naturally affected the church at large. The Roman Catholic historian v. Wessenberg gives a graphic account of the corruption which ensued. All church offices were bought and sold. Gold was the only evidence of fitness required. Among the clergy piety and the pursuit of knowledge were alike neglected. Schools degenerated. Abbots and monks spent their time in the chase, in games and entertainments, and the life of the cloisters in general was marked by indolence and frivolity. The remnants of the literary and theological treasures of antiquity were kept in these monasteries, not indeed for study and research, but for preservation as in dungeons and sepulchres. The degeneracy of the clergy led to the neglect of the religious instruction of the people. The Gospel was heard in few churches. In its stead the people were entertained with heathen fables and legends, and the services of the church degenerated into spectacular ceremonies and theatricals. While much ado was made about the canonization and beatification and veneration of departed saints, everything tended to depopulate and defile the church as the communion of saints on earth.

The return of the papal residence and court to Rome led to the papal Schism (1378-1417), when, for a period of about 40 years, the ostensible head of the church was divided into two and even three heads, each claiming to be the true successor of St. Peter and the real vicar of Christ. The jealousies and contentions of the French and Italian parties resulted in the election of two popes, one of whom resided at Avignon, (Clement VIII.) and the other at Rome (Urban VI.). This was not the first time indeed that the papacy was rent asunder. There had been antipopes before. Alexander III. (1159-81) had triumphed over three of these. The spectacle of three popes at the same time had not been unknown. (1033.) But the false had quickly succumbed. There had been no continuous schism. Now it was otherwise. The papacy, instead of being a symbol and pledge of the church's unity, was the prime source and spring of its discords and divisions. Try to grasp the practical results of such an ecclesiastical adminis-

tration in the parishes and communities of that age. All Christendom was necessarily divided into hostile camps. There was pope and antipope, each anathematizing the other and all his adherents. And this at a time when salvation was believed to depend on being in communion with the rightful successor of St. Peter. If the bishops and cardinals could not agree on the vital point, how could the people at large know whether they were within or without the one true and only saving church? Add to this uncertainty, with its consequent religious indifference and abandon on the one hand, and despair on the other, the burden of excessive taxation laid upon the poor people, the extravagant expense of maintaining two courts, with two and occasionally three colleges of cardinals with all their costly machinery, and we begin to get some conception of conditions becoming more and more intolerable, causing lands and people to groan in agony and to give vent to the cry which by and by became a formula on everybody's lips: "Reformation of the church in head and in members."

This cry partook of the force of a watchword expressing the general feeling of the need of a reformation. It was heard in high places and low, among the learned and ignorant, in universities and seats of learning, and at the imperial courts. But the more general and insistent the cry became, the more sedulously and strenuously was every suggestion and attempt at reformation opposed by the papal curia. And the papal court, entrenched behind impenetrable walls of superstition and arrogant pretensions, and wielding the deadly weapons of intimidation and intrigue, continued to maintain its place of almost undisputed sovereignty. No one, except perhaps an occasional demented fanatic and incorrigible heretic whose voice was soon silenced, thought of abolishing the papacy itself as an unwarranted human institution. The utmost to which the best reforming element aspired was the thought of setting bounds to its extravagant usurpations.

The university of Paris with its able chancellor, afterward Cardinal D'Ailly, and his still greater successor, John Gerson, took the lead in advocating and defending the rights of the church at large under and apart from the pope. Presenting and maintaining, as they did, the doctrine that a General Council is greater than any pope, that it is competent to act without him, even to depose him, if necessary, and elect another, their proposals must have appeared to the timid and uninformed like a piece of unparalleled audacity. But such advocates were needed to

prepare the way for the holding of a General Council of the church, to which all eyes began to turn and for which all earnest hearts began to yearn as for the only possible remedy of the church's ills, which, it was fondly hoped, would abolish all abuses and bring about a reformation of the church in its head and members. The popes and cardinals opposed with all their might the convocation of a church council, exhausted all their resources of wealthy intrigue, intimidation and flattery, to prevent it, and only yielded when they found it unsafe to longer resist. The agitation resulted in the convening of three successive reforming councils, at Pisa in 1409, at Constance, 1414, and Basel, 1431. The calling of the Council of Pisa was due largely to the powerful influence of the learned Paris chancellor Gerson. It was in session a little over four months. The rival popes (Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII) were summoned to appear before the Council, and not arriving, were deposed. Then the Council, instead of proceeding to consider ways and means of effecting the much needed reformation, fell into the fatal blunder of electing another pope, Alexander V., a man 70 years of age. But as neither of the other popes would yield, there were now three pontiffs instead of two, and outwardly affairs had become worse instead of better. The powerful head of the church had become a three-headed monster,—a Cerberus, as men were provoked to call it. Pope Alexander died the next year, and Balthazar Cossa, a notorious pirate and criminal, was elected as John XXIII, one of the most infamous of all popes,—“incarnate devil”, as some men of his own day dared to call him. In spite of the fact that things had come to a sorrier pass than before, the Paris theologians did not grow weary in reiterating and emphasizing the need of a reformation and in their demanding another General Council for the purpose of effecting the same. Aided by the influence of King Sigismund, this sentiment prevailed, and the pope was compelled against his will and in the face of alarming apprehensions for his own safety, to summon the so-called 16th ecumenical church council,—the brilliant and memorable Council of Constance.

II. We will now proceed to an examination of the character and complexion of this, the second and greatest of the three reforming councils in the dawn of the great Reformation.

Through the influence of the King and future German emperor the council was held not in an Italian city,



as the pope desired, but in Constance, a walled city on the south shore of Lake Constance, or, as it is also called the Bodensee, through which the classic Rhine flows, as it winds its majestic course amid scenes of chivalry and natural and architectural beauty from the snow-capped mountains of Switzerland to the sea. In what is now the merchants' hall of the city, once a Carthusian monastery, is still shown the room in which the great Council was held.

The King and pope have finally joined in despatching letters and messengers in all directions, summoning the representatives to the council which was to be opened Nov. 1, 1414. The anti-popes are not forgotten. They, too, are summoned to appear. Among those who made it a point to arrive early was Pope John himself. He had formed secret alliances with several princes and came provided with a large sum of money which he had amassed by simony and usury and intended to spend for bribes and hush-money. He was attended by a magnificent retinue numbering 1600 persons, among them the richest banker of Florence, who served in the capacity of financial agent to the pope. On Oct. 28th his splendid equipage might be seen with great show of pomp and power rolling through the gates of the city that had opened to receive and entertain this memorable gathering. On horseback rode the pope, and around him as a body guard and coronet of glory rode nine cardinals, several archbishops and other prelates, and Duke Frederick of Austria. Four or five days after the appointed time elapsed before the Council was opened by Pope John in the Cathedral with an elaborate and impressive ritual. Beside the elevated chair in which the pope sat were two others, evidently intended for the representatives of the two anti-popes. One of them was occupied, the other was vacant. Ten days after this opening service the first public session of the Council was held. The pope was annoyed and impatient on account of the absence of the King and his delay in coming, but King Sigismund seemed to be in no hurry and did not arrive until Christmas. A thousand persons constituted his retinue, as he rode into the city that was already teeming with strangers.

Let us look in upon this wonderful array of authority and talent and wealth and luxury, and learning and ecclesiastical and secular power. All lands of Christendom and thirty different languages are represented. The patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople are present in person. There are in attendance 33 cardinals, 344 bishops and arch-

bishops, 2,148 abbots, superintendents and doctors, 564 representatives of monasteries, over 18,000 clergy, besides countless princes, ambassadors of princes, representatives of free cities, dukes, nobles, knights,—each and all accompanied by equipages and retinues befitting their rank and corresponding to their purses, and vying with each other in making a show and attracting the vulgar gaze. For besides these dignitaries and powers the council was the occasion of drawing to the city a promiscuous crowd of hangers-on,—thousands of prostitutes, pickpockets, street venders, peddlers, actors, jugglers,—constituting a side-show as heterogeneous and varied as the great assemblage itself was stupendous in its magnificent assumptions and its inward hollowness. The R. Cath. chronicler Wessenberg states that during the four years which the Council managed to drag the weary length of its sorry business the number of strangers to be cared for in the city was regularly 50,000 and at times rose to 150,000,—not to speak of the 30,000 horses that had to be fed.

A glance at several of the leaders and influential members must suffice to give us some idea of the moral character and theological complexion of the Council. The majestic figure and pleasant face of King Sigismund attract the eye. He is in his 46th year, and his political life has been turbulent and trying. In character he is a strange mixture of good and bad qualities. He is quick and brave and generous, yet not without duplicity and deceit. His demeanor in public is polished and knightly. He is a natural orator and makes a favorable impression on all. But he is deficient in the very essential quality of consistency and perseverance. As emperor he regarded himself as the divinely appointed civil head and protector of the church, yet lacked the originality and independence needed in order to cope with the great problems of the age.

Among the theologians, earnestly desiring a reform, we notice the learned Peter D'Ailly, "the eagle" among the teachers of France, formerly chancellor of the university of Paris, now cardinal and archbishop of Cambrai, Robert Halam, archbishop of Salisbury, who had published articles exposing and denouncing the prevalent corruption of the clergy. There is Theodoric of Münster, professor at Cologne, who, in an address delivered at one of the early sessions of the Council, sternly rebuked the excesses and profligacy of the clergy and compared many of them to a stinking carcass that attracts birds of prey to devastate the

vineyard of the Lord, and blamed them essentially for neglecting the study of the Scriptures and spending their time instead in studying the canonical laws in the decretals for the purpose of learning the art of money making. And many other earnest voices were raised in this Council against the existing disorders and abuses in the church. But towering above the rest in breadth of learning, independence of thought and fearlessness in utterance was John Gerson, chancellor of Paris. Distinguished not only for versatility of learning, but also for piety and religious earnestness, he had received the commendable epithet, Dr. Christianissimus. He was the first French theologian who dared to make occasional use of the vernacular in some of his published treatises. Embarrassed by no sort of personal or official relations to the papal curia, he was able to proceed more freely and independently than D'Ailly, his predecessor in office. Gerson had called the church of his day "not apostolic, but apostate." At the first opportunity he presented to the Council a treatise in which he boldly exposed and vehemently condemned the prevailing simony in the church. He was the boldest and strongest advocate and expounder of the doctrine that the highest authority of the church is inherent not in the pope, but in the general councils as representatives of the whole church. Herein Gerson claimed to see both the principle which demanded and justified a reconstruction of the ecclesiastical relations and the means for bringing about a reformation. At the same time he was, like the body of the representatives at the Council, a bigoted and blinded Romanist, unable to break away from the established order of things doctrinally. He adhered tenaciously to the Romish dogmas in every respect. While he held the Bible to be the source of all Christian knowledge, yet he taught and insisted that the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular should not be permitted, that, whoever would not unconditionally submit to the decision of the church in the interpretation of the Scriptures, should be condemned as a heretic. This may help to prepare us to consider briefly

### III. The proceedings and results of the council.

As to the mode of conducting the business and adopting measures it was arranged that all matters should be considered and passed upon by the representatives of the different nations at their separate sessions before being laid before the plenary council. This mode of voting and deciding matters had the advantage of breaking the pow-

erful influence of the Italian prelates who were present in full force in the interest of Pope John. At the beginning of the council there were four nations represented, viz., England, Germany, France and Italy. After the 37th session (April 1, 1417) when the anti-pope, Benedict XIII, having refused to submit or resign, was formally deposed, Spain was admitted as the fifth nation. Each national delegation chose its own chairman, who presided in turn for a month.

The objects proposed were three: 1. To bring the papal schism to an end. 2. To pass judgment upon the heresis of Wiclif and Hus. 3. To carry out the much talked of and sorely needed reform in head and members. Considering all the circumstances of the case, the spirit of the times, the deep-seated prejudices of the age, the virulence and insidiousness of the prevailing abuses and corruption, the great advantage of the popes, who, having canonries, deaneries, bishoprics, cardinalates and other offices to give away, had all the venal talent of a mercenary age at their command, the task confronting these representatives of the Church was indeed a stupendous one. The factors constituting the various problems ran out into endless ramifications and involved elements and interests of the most conflicting and antagonistic nature. It would be a bewildering and wearying task to attempt going into the details of the prolonged proceedings. And yet, having examined at some length the red tape and fruitless formality and learned discussions and finespun distinctions, I must confess that I found the perusal interesting and in part even fascinating, so weird and novel, so admirable and pitiable in the mixture and confused jumble of patience and impetuosity, of learning and ignorance, of child-like simplicity and fiendish cunning of faith and faithlessness, of earnestness and levity, of moral courage and moral cowardice, of hope and despair. Among the things that strike the observer as remarkable is the terrible tyranny of deep-rooted prejudices of long standing and growth. Another circumstance that forms a striking and amusing contrast to the hurry and bustle, the enterprise and despatch of our electric age is the slow pace and the self-indulgent ease with which the momentous business is allowed to drag on. The council was in session nearly four years, and in that time 45 public sessions were held. The first work which the council attempted was that of getting rid of the popes. The month of November was spent in fruitless efforts to agree on plans and methods and set things in motion. Then the counsellors engaged in elaborate discussions with

reference to the position of Pope John and the right of the council to demand his resignation. After that three months passed without a public session. The first session was held in November, the fourth on March 30 of the next year, and the fifth seven days later. Of course, during these long intervals the delegations held separate meetings and there were some very earnest discussions, but certainly plenty of time was taken and given for the rest and indulgence of the outer and inner man, for social functions and entertainments, for the running of private establishments, the grinding of axes, the forging of machinations, the plying of art and intrigue, the fostering of vice and shame.

I shall not tire you with the details leading up to the deposition of the good-for-nothing popes who, more than all other hindrances combined, stood in the way of the desired reforms, and who held on to their place and power so tenaciously. One is at a loss to know whether to admire the patience or to look with pity and contempt upon the culpable indulgence of the good fathers of the council in their dealings with the deep-dyed and notorious criminal whose authority as pope they had been acknowledging. Months were spent in idle and futile negotiations with him, endeavoring to persuade him to resign. The document that was circulated in Constance, charging the pope with a long catalogue of heinous sins and crimes, many of which could be easily proved by credible witnesses, John's terror and flight in disguise, his chicanery and hopes of breaking up the council, the consternation of many in Constance in view of his withdrawal from the city, the firmness and coolness of King Sigismund and the powerful sermon by Gerson, setting forth the rights of a Church council apart from the pope and even against him, John's sentence, imprisonment and release—all this constitutes an interesting story and a vivid picture of the times. In short, at the 10th session (May 14, 1415) the council solemnly suspended the incorrigible pope, and at the twelfth session he was formally deposed, an appointed delegation conveyed to him the official notification of the act, and the council breathed a little more freely when it received his official sanction and approval of the procedure. One of the anti-popes (Gregory XII) consented to resign, the other (Benedict XIII) was deposed, but not before the thirty-seventh session.

It is a singular fact that, while the majority of the council, together with the best members of the Church everywhere, felt above all things the need of reform, this, the gravest interest of all, was the last thing to be taken up.

It was crowded into the last sessions and finally crowded out of the council altogether. The opinion prevailed that the schism and seeds of heresy must be gotten rid of first. The emperor, together with the German and English counselors, urged the importance of proceeding with the consideration of the necessary reforms before electing a new pope. The question was discussed at length, with eloquence, learning and specious arguments on either side. Even men like D'Ailly and Gerson, in spite of the warning of history, advocated the election of a pope as a necessary introduction to reform measures. Then jealousies and selfish interests began to assert themselves, and suspicion was noised abroad that the German emperor might assume too much authority if there were no pope to curtail and curb his assumptions. The Church, it was maintained, must have a head, by that was meant a pope, otherwise the organism would be incomplete and the Church would be in the greatest peril. Against the Romanizing view and hierarchical faction the Germans held out longest and made a noble protest, but finally they, too, were silenced, several of their ablest leaders having succumbed to the arts of flattery and bribery. The five delegations agreed in consenting to the immediate election of a pope, Sigismund and the Germans giving their consent with the express proviso that, after the election, pope and council should proceed at once to inaugurate the necessary reform measures. After the 41st session of the council, the electors—23 cardinals and 31 prelates representing the different nations—assembled in conclave, and after three days (Nov. 11, 1417) united in the election of Cardinal Oddo Colonna, who became pope under the name of Martin V. He was a man of 40, of a noble Roman family, but had not distinguished himself in any particular way. But he was shrewd enough and base enough to follow in the footsteps of his predecessors, to defeat the aims and purposes of those who were honestly seeking to effect reforms, and to dismiss the council with fair promises and delusive hopes, but with its most important and proper work hardly begun. At the 43d session a few insignificant reforming articles were adopted, showing the good intentions of the pope to take the lead in bringing about a reformation. But he had succeeded in artfully demoralizing the council, creating divisions among the members, inflaming national rivalries and jealousies, making separate treaties with the individual nations, getting them to magnify their individual interests and to lose sight of the main cause, and so, at the 45th session (April 22, 1418), he dis-

solved the weary council, granted all members life-long indulgence, and left the city in pompous procession, his bridle held on one side by the emperor, on the other by the elector of Brandenburg, and a train of 40,000 persons accompanying him a distance on horseback. Verily, the papacy had gained a signal triumph. The western churches all acknowledged him the lawful pope, and the papal schism was practically ended.

Ridpath, in his *Univ. Hist.*, says: "After 45 months of wrangling, the greatest, wisest and most imposing body which Christendom had ever assembled, could present nothing to the world, nothing to history, but the vision of two stakes with their dying victims, crying up to heaven through the crackle and war of the flames, and casting spectral shadows across the placid bosom of Lake Constance."

Yes, I referred in my opening remarks to the odor of burning human flesh that adheres to this memorable council of the middle ages. The story of the martyrdom of John Hus and Jerome of Prague is, in a general way at least, familiar to every Lutheran, for they are frequently referred to as among the worthy witnesses to the truth, entitling them to be called reformers before the Reformation. I did not wish to insert this pathetic incident in its proper place chronologically in giving a survey of the proceedings of the council, but preferred to reserve it for special treatment.

During the first few months of its stay at Constance, while the council was embarrassed and perplexed in the midst of negotiations with the infamous pope, the Wiclifite and Hussite heresies likewise claimed its attention and gave this august, reforming council occasion to demonstrate its zeal for the accepted and standing doctrines of the Church. In the month of May, 1415, the council condemned the teachings of Wiclif, adjudged him a heretic and ordered his bones to be dug up and scattered. (The decree was carried out 12 years later.) On the 6th of July Hus was condemned and burned at the stake, and May 23, of the following year, his friend and colleague, Jerome, met a similar fate.

At the time of the opening of the Council at Constance John Hus, rector of the University of Prague, Bohemia's capital, who had denounced indulgences and had publicly burned the pope's bull in the streets of Prague, stood excommunicated and outlawed. Cited to appear before the council, he went to Constance with joyfulness and confident assurance of the righteousness of the cause in which he was

to give an account. In spite of the safe-conduct, the promise of imperial protection, which King Sigismund had given him, within 24 days after his arrival (Nov. 4-28) he was thrown into prison on some false pretense, and he never regained his liberty. When the king heard of this infringement of his promise he was displeased and demanded the liberation of the accused. But a deputation of the council waited on him and succeeded in apparently convincing him that he had exceeded his authority in granting a safe-conduct to a heretic, and that therefore his promise was null and void. Hus continued to languish in prison, occupying dungeons in different places, sometimes suffering the utmost discomfort from neglect and foul surroundings, manacled and chained like a criminal, and tortured for nearly seven months by importunities and assaults made upon him in private by those who were bent on wresting from him the concession: "I recant." Only three public hearings were granted him (June 5, 7 and 8, 1415), and these, so far from being conducted with fairness and sobriety and candor befitting a cause so momentous, were tumultuous and disorderly meetings, at which the accused had little opportunity to do more than disclaim teachings and protest against doctrines which his accusers persisted in falsely charging against him, and where his efforts to express his conviction and define and defend his patriotism and tenets were frequently interrupted and borne down by the clamorous cries of his enemies: "Recant! recant!" His humility and gentleness amid such unfair treatment, the joyfulness of his faith, his Christian confidence and constancy, standing as he did alone amid learned and astute opponents, bear eloquent testimony to the evangelical spirit with which he was imbued, though he had not as yet emerged into the full light and clear apprehension of the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

Among the most bitter of his opponents were two Bohemian theologians who had followed him from Prague and were eager for his condemnation. Cardinal D'Ailly was particularly hard on him and drove him into close quarters by drawing fine-spun inferences from his published statements. Gerson had discovered 19 heretical sentences in his treatise on the Church, and backed by the varied resources of his scholastic and philosophical learning he pressed upon the prisoner without mercy. The charges made against Hus were various. Some were farfetched and manifestly invented, such, for instance, as this, that as a realist he *could not* be sound on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.



Others were vague and indefinite, such as no court of justice could in fairness think of entertaining. But some of the charges pertained to really weak and questionable points in his teachings, and the able leaders of the arraignment were only too eager to take advantage of any vulnerable spot in his armor. And Hus, though himself a scholar of no mean repute and an earnest theologian, was no match for the most accomplished theologians and debaters of the day by whom he was surrounded. The real point at issue between Hus and the orthodox representatives of Catholicism was the relative authority of Church and of Scripture. They demanded of Huss retraction and unconditional submission to the church, i. e., to the decision of the council, as representing the church at large, while Hus, like Luther after him, felt in conscience bound only by the revelation of God's will in Holy Scripture and continued to appeal to the declarations of the written Word as final and supreme authority. Had he recanted—though he was not apprised of the result in such case—his sentence would have been degradation from the priesthood and lifelong imprisonment. But he did not recant. In the face of persecution, degradation and death he continued to stand alone and maintain his solitary witness for what he believed to be divine and eternal truth.

We hasten to cast a reverent and mournful look upon the final scene. It is the 6th of July, 1415. The council is assembled for a public service in the cathedral. A man who by searching the Scriptures has reached convictions different from those which are current in the church which by universal concession is so greatly in need of a reform in head and in members and who, having the courage of his convictions, refuses to have his conscience bound by the arbitrary decisions of fallible men, is to be condemned to die the death of a heretic and incorrigible malefactor. The bishop manages to preach a plain and pointed sermon on the suggestive text, Rom. 6, 6: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Besides wresting the text to the destruction of Hus he congratulates the King upon the accomplishment of this noble feat, assuring him that by consenting to the condemnation of this archheretic he will immortalize his name. The long list of heresies charged against Hus is once more read out before him, and he is once more called upon to recant. He repeats with modesty and firmness his former protestations, that some of the things charged against him

he never held nor taught, and declares again his unflinching adherence to the Word of God. Though fully aware that his fate is sealed, he refers to the safe-conduct promised him by King Sigismund, and as he turns his weary eyes upon the latter with the pathetic reproach of helpless innocence, the King turns away his face and would fain hide the blush of guilt which he cannot restrain. Then, kneeling down, the prisoner, in the spirit of the crucified Redeemer, of Stephen and other faithful witnesses to Christ, prays God to pardon his enemies and persecutors. The solemn rite of deposing the condemned man from the priesthood is now enacted with much show of holy indignation and abhorrence of heresy. Seven bishops take part in the impressive performance. The prisoner is clothed in priestly robes, and then these are removed one by one, accompanied each time by a form of malediction. The sacred chalice is placed in his hands and taken away in the same expressive manner. A tall paper cap, painted over with flames and devils, and inscribed "Heresiarch," is placed upon his head. The representatives of the council and of the church complete the excommunication of the condemned with the words: "We deliver thy soul to the devil"—"And I," Hus meekly replies, "commit it into the hands of our Savior Jesus Christ." The same day he is delivered to the civil magistrate and led away to the place of execution. At the stake he repeatedly utters the hallowed prayer of dying saints: "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit!" Amid prayer and praise, with joyful confidence in the righteousness and ultimate triumph of the cause for which he dies, the fearless martyr's soul takes its victorious flight, leaving behind its charred and crumbling tenement of clay, whose ashes are afterward thrown into the Rhine, and entering the eternal city, whose Maker and Builder is God.

In closing this instructive narrative let me merely allude to two questions of special interest. On the face of it, if we had not examined the conditions surrounding the council, the character of the time and of the men, it would seem marvelous, almost incredible indeed and unaccountable, that a stately Church Council, composed of many learned and godly men, and professedly assembled for the avowed purpose of bringing about a much needed reformation of the church in all its departments and members, should have agreed in condemning to death the only true and effective reformer among them, the only one who had the divine grace and spiritual insight and courage to strike at the root of the existing evils and had proposed the very

remedy that was needed and the only remedy that was adequate to the case. When all the circumstances are taken into consideration, it is plain enough, though none the less pitiable, an exhibition of the distorted vision, if not the total blindness, with which even the leaders of the church were smitten, an illustration of the awful tyranny of deep-seated prejudices and long continued customs and methods of thinking and doing. Of course there were many varying factors and conflicting forces that entered into the contest and contributed to the weak and lamentable results. There were many corrupt and corrupting influences, the foul use of money and ecclesiastical offices, the application of favor and flattery on the one hand, and of threat and intimidation on the other, the animosity of antagonistic schools of philosophy, (Oxford and Prague standing for realism and Paris for nominalism), the antipathy of the Germans who had been seriously offended during certain contentions in the University of Prague, the disposition to magnify and unduly emphasize private and national interests, the jealousies and strifes engendered and fostered by malignant spirits bent on continuing the reign of carnal lust and corruption, and the like. But aside from all considerations of lesser weight, the main point and unpardonable position, it seems to me, was this, that in the estimation of the fathers and better minded leaders of the church Hus, by his seemingly arbitrary methods, was menacing the existing conception of the church and churchly authority. The fatal blindness of these well meaning men was caused by their tenacious belief in the absolute necessity of the papacy in order to constitute and complete the church and conserve her unity, and by their ill advised desire to supplant papal autocracy and tyranny by synodical authority and power. They accepted without question the religious dogmas and tenets which had come down to them from former generations. They had not the critical insight to distinguish truth from error. Whilst admitting no errors in doctrine, they contended only against the flagrant abuses in practice, ignoring the fact that these were only the outgrowths of those radical errors. Wiclif and Hus had subordinated the authority of man and of every body of men to the supreme and only infallible authority of the Word of God. They dared to stand for the right of private judgment and of the individual conscience. That was the point of divergence between them and the great council of the church. And a hundred years of further conflict and preparation passed by before that revolutionary principle was reaffirmed by

the monk of Wittenberg and enforced before the emperor and representatives of the realm at Worms. The fathers of the Council of Constance did not know that they were destroying the true reformer of the church. They thought that by exposing and condemning what they believed to be heresies and by dealing with the incorrigible heretic in the heroic way which had been sanctioned and sanctified by the inquisitorial practices of the church for two centuries, they were doing God service and showing commendable zeal for the purity of doctrine and the integrity of the church.

The other question of concluding interest pertains to the actual fruitage of this great assemblage of the medieval church. What of the success and permanent results of these three reforming councils—Pisa, Constance and Basel? Sadly disappointing as they were, “so stately in appearance, so impotent in fact,” they were not total failures. While seeming to have accomplished nothing, they exercised in the times which followed an influence truly penetrating and far reaching. The medieval papacy, the head and front, the source and centre, of the most alarming evils and glaring corruption, had received a severe blow. The Hildebrandine idea of the church—an earthly organization in which only one person has any rights—which had dominated the church and the world for nearly three centuries, was broken, having been questioned, doubted, denied with sufficient emphasis, so that it would never again hope to hold mankind within its arrogant grasp. In the providence of God the Council of Constance played its part in preparing the church for a truer and greater deliverance than any which could have been wrought before the forces at command at that time. The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small. Let us be patient unto the coming of the Lord. For when time shall have run its course, and the smoke of many battles been merged into the smoke of flaming worlds, then will appear the victory of the Son of man, and the kingdoms of this world will have become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ.

## ELOCUTION FOR PREACHERS OR PUBLIC SPEAKING.

BY REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

### . BREATHING.

It may seem to many a gratuitous task to write on this topic. As all live by breathing, the reader may say, why discuss such a subject? Are there not more important matters for the speaker? It is a very important subject and worthy not only of attention but also of practice until good results are obtained.

Section 7. General discussion. The public speaker should inform himself in regard to the importance of breathing for health, for ease and comfort in speech and for tone production.

We are surrounded by air and we live by it, and yet very few people inhale enough air for good activity and for good health. They breathe too frequently but do not innaie deep enough and fill the lungs as they should.

When I began to give attention to this topic my normal respiration—inhalation and exhalation—was from 19 to 21 per minute. After some weeks of attention and practice the number was from 12 to 15. Two things appear from this fact; one is that more air at one time was in the lungs, and the other is, the machinery will not wear out so quickly at this lower rate of action. There is a satisfaction also in this greater amount of air in the lungs and an invigoration that works for good only.

One must be able to fill the lungs with wholesome air and get rid of as much dead air as possible. The air is turned into tone when it leaves the larynx in the effort of speech. It is just as important that the speaker utilize the air he gets into his lungs as it is for him to fill them. There are more failures in this regard than in the inhalation. A breath consists of an inhalation and exhalation. Many people can take a deep and full inhalation, but cannot utilize it for speech. As soon as tone begins the air escapes in a hurry and they have no proper control of it. One should be able to hold a clear and even tone for forty seconds. It cannot be done at once; but practice three times per day, morning, noon and night, on an empty stomach, for three months, will enable almost any one to do it. Where I grew up as a boy the house and barn stood about ten rods apart.

In some way the practice of holding a tone while walking or running that distance was indulged in. It was a most excellent exercise and helped to develop lungs and give control of breath. Inhalations should be through the nostrils, as they were given us for that purpose and have within them the proof of it; exhalations may be through the mouth, as that is the way speech takes place.

The evenness, purity and power of the tone depend largely upon the use and control of the breath. There can be no power without breath, and breath under control. We may liken the lungs to a reservoir and the muscles that expel the air to a bellows; if the bellows work steady and regular the stream of air will be constant and the tone can be what it ought to be. Tone ordinarily needs very little air to sustain it; too much makes it unsteady, aspirated and imperfect. Therefore, it is evident why so much depends upon the ability to exhale in accordance with the needs of tone production.

"The amount of air ordinarily inspired for vital wants is quite insufficient for vocal purposes. Speech must be preceded by a deeper than common inspiration, and sustained by replenishments of more than common frequency. The lungs are supplied with air by the expansion of the cavity of the chest; and they are made to yield the air they contain by its contraction from the pressure of its walls and base. The cavity of the chest is conical in form, tapering from its muscular base—the diaphragm—by the ribs and clavicle, to the windpipe. The chest is expanded by the bulging of the ribs, the raising of the clavicle (or breast-bone), and the descent or flattening of the diaphragm. Expiration may be produced either by means of the bony frame-work or of the muscular base of the chest. The latter is the correct mode of vocal expiration. Too much importance cannot be attached to the formation of a habit of easy respiration. The walls of the chest should not be allowed to fall in speaking, but the whole force of expiration should be confined to the diaphragm. Clavicular respiration is the prevailing error of those who find speaking or reading laborious. When the respiration is properly conducted, vocal exercise should be unfatiguing, even though long continued; and the longer it is practiced the more should it be conducive to health. The inspiration in speaking must be noiseless. Audible suction of the air is as unnecessary as it is ungraceful."

It is a common fault seen in singers that the chest moves up and down. Such movement is exhausting and often injurious in its consequences. The same fault may be seen every day by a little attention to the persons with whom you come into contact. It is a safe expression that were it not for the restoration made in sleep by correct breathing, many more would die annually from lung diseases than now do. In sleep no raising and falling of the chest will be seen in a healthy person. Nature restores in sleep what people destroy when they are awake.

"We term sleep a death; and yet it is waking that kills us."—Sir Thomas Browne.

"The innocent sleep, sleep that knits up the ravelled sleeve of care,

Great Nature's second course, chief nourisher in life's feast."—Shakespeare.

#### Section 8. Exercises.

1. Lie on the back on the floor with no cushion under the head. The very best breathing work can be done in this position. Be quiet, make no effort to direct the breathing. It will be observed that the movement is at the diaphragm. There will be no difference in this whether the person be male or female. Let each one try this long enough to see that it is nature's way, and then we may hope that he will resolve in active life to carry out breathing as God indicates it in His restorer sleep.

2. To empty the lungs. In all the following exercises take standing position as in section 5. Pronounce the word "far" in a whisper and make the sound strong and hard, emptying the lungs as quickly and completely as possible. Then with mouth closed inhale inaudibly until the lungs are well filled.

3. With the chest raised and held active as in correct chest position, count one hundred, and one, etc., up to 200, uttering the word slowly and distinctly on one breath, then inhale as much as possible without any noise. Keep this up three times a day for all time.

4. Hold a clear tone for 40 seconds. Hold 5 seconds; rest. Hold 10 seconds; rest. Hold 15 seconds; rest. For the first week count only 5 seconds and then rest. Then increase to 10 and practice this for a week. Then increase to 15 and practice for two weeks. The person will then be in condition to go on and practice to reach the 40 mark.

5. To fill the lungs. After saying "far," or counting, fill the lungs as completely as possible, then rise

on the toes and take in a little more breath, and keep on rising and grasping breath until the lungs are as full as they can be made. When thus full, hold for some time and let it pass away quietly and gradually, not at once or with a noise or collapse of the chest.

Good deep breathing combines the abdominal, the costal and the dorsal, or the use of these three sets of muscles—all the muscles of the waist unite in the work and work in unison. If the hands be clasped around the waist with the thumbs behind, correct breathing will enable one to feel the movement all the way round. But if the chest be held in position as it ought to be, by its own muscles, the breathing will largely take care of itself. If dizziness arises in any of these exercises, stop for a while, or balance yourself on one foot, rise on the toes and swing other foot, and the difficulty will pass away.

Before we pass to the voice and its action much time and labor are saved if we learn to understand and appreciate the proper position of the vocal organs, the throat, larynx, uvula, tongue and mouth.

Section 9. The Throat. The throat should be opened well. The neck should come down and out like that of the bird when it sings, making what some call the double chin. This must be done by an action of the throat muscles. It is accomplished by the so-called Corner Exercise.

The throat may be said to have three positions.

1. Its normal or ordinary carriage.
2. An inward position made by pressing the hand or forefinger against this corner whereby the throat would be closed and the tone would be squeezed.
3. An outward position brought about by carrying the throat down and out. This may be accomplished by pushing the throat in by the hand or forefinger, and then letting the pressure go and following the hand by the throat. Finally it will come down below its normal carriage. Let the mind be directed to this end and soon good results will be obtained.

Section 10. The root of tongue exercise. The throat will not assume its right position unless the base of the tongue goes down and fills the forward space made by lowering the throat. The speaker needs a good throat opening, and that is much more and different from mouth opening. Nothing can atone for this lack. The tongue should go back in the mouth and the base come forward



in the aperture made by the corner exercise. Here are exercises for practice:

1. Gape or yawn and the tongue will be depressed.
2. Carry the tongue forward between the teeth; then draw the whole tongue vigorously backward as if trying to swallow it. Or, pass the tip of the tongue along the roof of the mouth to a point as far back as possible.
3. Purse the lips and protrude them as far as possible while sounding oo as in boot from the middle pitch of the voice to the lowest possible pitch and holding it.

These movements should be practiced and studied till the base of the tongue can be easily and loosely dropped at will. Such action may change the whole power of a speaker. The tongue is not only an unruly member in a religious sense, but it is true in elocution also. Before one can speak trippingly on the tongue and carry out Shakespeare's directions he must get the base of the tongue down, make a good throat aperture, and leave room for the air column to enter the mouth without obstruction and permit the tip of the tongue to be loose in order that the words may roll off of it trippingly.

Section 11. Raising and lowering the larynx. The larynx (Adam's apple) rises and falls with the base of the tongue to which it is attached. In swallowing it ascends to its highest pitch and in gaping it descends. The larynx rises and falls very much with the pitch. It can be felt by the hand in singing the musical scale. It is made strong and healthy by its vigorous use. There is great possibility for the singer or speaker in the correct use and control of the larynx. Volume and power can be obtained by lowering the base of the tongue and holding the larynx in its lowest position. The vocal cords are in the larynx and the voice is produced there. The exercise consists in raising it to its utmost height in the throat and lowering it to its greatest depth.

Section 12. The Uvula. As the tongue descends the uvula tends to ascend. In the roof of the mouth are found the hard and soft palate. The hard palate is back of the teeth, and back of it is the soft palate to which the uvula is attached. In many people the uvula is greatly enlarged and fails to do as nature intends it. When it falls upon the tongue the passage to the mouth is closed and the vocal current escapes by the nostrils, and thus nasal tones are produced. To avoid nasality the palate must be sufficiently raised.

The soft palate is raised in the act of gaping.

Exercise: Say a, then e, and then fix the throat to say i, but do not say it, and you will feel and recognize the raising of the soft palate. A mirror should be used, and the exercise practiced until the uvula is absorbed in the palate; then in voice work it will not descend when it ought not and obstruct the tone and injure the throat.

Another exercise is: Take a low tone and hold it and then turn it into tremolo, and the uvula will rise.

Section 13. The mouth. The mouth, including the lips, should open and shut so as to form the letters easily without any adjusting after the tone has begun. Practice the following exercise:

Say ee—ah—oo; first firmly and accurately, and then as rapidly as possible. In saying e keep the lips flat and draw the aperture as far into the cheeks as can be; ah should separate the teeth till three fingers can enter; and oo rounds the lips with the smallest aperture conceivable, till only the lead of a pencil will enter.

---

## WHAT GREAT MEN THINK OF THE BIBLE.

### FROM GUTHE'S PASTORALSPIEGEL.

Clement of Alexandria: God's Word is the word of the truth, the imperishable word and the stimulus to eternal salvation.

Origen: Before all things study the Holy Scriptures; but let it be an earnest study, for the Scriptures need to be studied earnestly, that we may not rashly pass judgment on them! And if thou studieth the Holy Scriptures with a believing and God-pleasing mind, then knock where aught is closed to thee, and it will be opened by the porter, of whom Jesus Christ speaks (John 10, 3): "To him the porter openeth." Ask of God with firm faith, to disclose the meaning of the Scriptures hidden from the great multitude.

The reading of the Holy Scriptures is intercourse with God. God's grace permitted these books to be written by publicans, fishermen, tent-makers, that each one might read and understand them.

Chrysostom: As medicine helps the suffering body, so God's Word helps the sick soul.

The reading of the Holy Scriptures is a mighty defense against sin. Ignorance of them is a deep, yawning precipice. To know nothing of divine laws is a great loss of happiness.—He who reads constantly in the Scriptures and sits beside its brooks, will derive great benefit to his inner life, even if he has no commentator.

Jerome: The Bible is a stream, in which the elephant swims and the lamb does not drown.

Augustine: The Holy Scripture is an epistle from the almighty God to His creatures, as easily understood as a letter which one receives from his friend.

Whoever imagines he has understood the Holy Scriptures well, but is not edified by this understanding in the love of God and of the neighbor, has not yet understood them.

He is thy true servant, Lord, who draws near to Thee, not to hear that he wills, but to will what he hears.

The Scripture shows us examples of good men who have fallen, and of bad men who have been converted, that the righteous may not become proud and that the bad may not in despair, persist in their sin.

Gregory the Great: What else is the Holy Scripture than a letter of God to men? Suppose thou hadst an office and didst receive a letter from an earthly prince, wouldst thou be able to sleep before thou hadst examined what thy master had written thee? And thou canst be indifferent respecting that letter which the Lord of men and angels sends thee? So, beyond comparison, it surpasses all science and learning! It proclaims nothing except the truth and invites to the heavenly home, it diverts the reader's mind from the earth and leads it to strive after higher things, through dark passages it preserves the strong minds in activity and with its sweet language it receives the weak; it removes all displeasure, if one reads it frequently, and is read the more gladly the more one thinks upon it; it is understood by the unlearned and to the learned it remains ever new; through simplicity of language it comes to the help of the reader's mind and through the higher meaning it lifts him up and perfects his soul.

Luther: God's Word must be the Christian's vital element. What his house is to man, the pasture to the beast, its nest to the bird, the rock to the goat and the stream to the fish, that the Holy Scripture is to believing souls.

Through the Word the world is conquered, through the Word the church has been preserved, through the Word the church will again rise.

Melanchthon: Let us consider well, what an infinite benefit of God it is, that He has given and preserved to His church a reliable book, and that He binds the church to the same. Only that people is the church, which comprehends, hears and learns this book, and clings to its uncorrupted meaning in its worship of God as well as in the regulation of its morals.

Bugenhagen: It is a great thing to have God's Word and sufficient to eat.

Search the Scriptures. If thou knowest Jesus aright, thou needest to know nothing else; if thou knowest not Jesus, all other knowledge is vain.

Zwingli: Holy Scripture is an illimitable sea that can not be sailed, a field that no one has yet measured according to its worth, and in which all the minds of all centuries have been exercised.

Calvin: If one asks, how should we know that the Scripture has come from God, without resorting to the resolutions of the church, that is as much as asking, how shall we learn to distinguish light from darkness, black from white, sweet from bitter? For the Scripture bears no less proof of its truth in itself than white and black things bear of their color, sweet and bitter, of their taste. If we desire to prevent men's minds from being driven about by variable doubts and taking offense at every little thing, then the conviction that God is the author of the Scripture must be built on more solid ground than human arguments and hypotheses, namely on the mysterious testimony of the Holy Ghost.

Bengel: Thou findest theological truths better nowhere else than in the Holy Scripture itself, and it is explained by nothing more safely than by itself. Therefore I give my notes on the New Testament the modest title: "Gnomon"; for they do not teach, they only trace, what lies in the text.

Oetinger: I have despaired of all human teachings, controversies and the like and take my only refuge in the Holy Scripture and in nature. For the works of God, if one contemplates them, help to the understanding of the Holy Scripture and the Holy Scripture to the understanding of the works of God. God is not a God of yesterday, but from the beginning He has joined together His created

and His verbal revelation, and in this is comprised the whole of the sacred Scripture. He, therefore, who separates the verbal expressions of God from those He has given us in His creatures, can not teach with energy.

Tersteegen: One must read the Holy Scriptures prayerfully; because all light, blessing and energy come only by grace from the Holy Ghost. Whoever does not read the Scripture with a heart turned prayerfully to God, returns from a full table empty, faint and poor, however much the head may have retained. If we read the Bible rightly, God speaks to us; and every thing that we read should give us occasion to speak with God. We should change all the promises and commandments into short prayers, and frequently interrupt our reading with silent elevation of the heart to God. He who thus reads in the presence of God and with God, will on every hand find pasture, where he will go in and out with the Shepherd.

One can understand no book rightly, much less the Holy Scripture, if he does not at least to some extent enter into the spirit and mind of the author. Now we can not believe in what a peculiar, devout, pure and godly mind the holy writers were when they wrote the Bible; and therefore in this disposition all readers should endeavor to enter the Scriptures, if they would understand them, or rather the Holy Spirit, aright.

Wisdom never comes into a wicked soul and does not dwell in a body subjected to sin. The Holy Spirit flees falsehood and foolish reflections. Only the pure in heart behold God and His truth. We attain to this purity of heart when we learn, by the power of God's grace, in radical self-denial to withdraw our hearts from all corruptible lusts and to think of and love God alone. Then the eye of the soul will be opened, and will be bright, and the atmosphere of the heart serene and pure, so that the brightness of the Lord is reflected therein.

Schleiermacher: If the seed of the divine Word in the soul has attained a happy growth, there will proceed thence good spiritual health.

Menken: In the Holy Scripture there are not contained several different divine relations, each of which stands for itself, and could be understood in and for itself and would suffice because of its completeness; it contains one continuous revelation, which has reached completion through the testimony of Jesus Christ and of His apostles, and which to be rightly understood, must be taken in their unity and as a whole.

If a man draws forth and accepts from the divine revelation what he would have and know if there had never been a real revelation, he then only believes himself and other men, but not the revelation, he thereby declares that part, which contains for him actual revelation, to be untrue, and he acts foolishly and dishonestly if he still claims faith in the revelation. For the substance of Holy Scripture has to do entirely with things which no eye hath seen, no ear hath heard, no heart conceived of, but which God has revealed to His holy apostles and prophets through the Holy Ghost! Him, who comes to the Holy Scriptures as a righteous man, they condemn: whoever comes as a sinner, to him they graciously point out the way to righteousness and peace; they instruct him who comes as a pupil; to him who comes as a child, they disclose the kingdom of God; but when a man comes to them as a master, they laugh at him, in their exceeding, truly divine superiority they bring to naught the wisdom of the wise, and reject the judgment of the knowing.

They are set, as was He of whom they testify, for judgment in the world, that they who see not might see, and they who see might become blind,—the book of God, and in every respect a wonderful book.

Mallet: The Holy Scripture is the greatest relic and the richest treasure of the human race. All divine light and life have come from it. Wherever it is not, there darkness covers the earth and gross darkness the people. Only where it appears does the day begin to dawn. All other writings have only a limited signification for the different conditions, spheres and callings of life; this book is for poor and rich, for men and women, for old people and children, for learned and unlearned, for all nations that are under the heaven,—it is the book of the world. All other books are limited in their duration, they were not at one time and they will again pass away; but of this book one can say: it endures from eternity to eternity.

There is nothing on earth with which men have occupied themselves as much as with this book, and nothing against which they have so bitterly fought; for its contents are too rich and too deep for man to exhaust them, and too glorious and terrible for men to remain indifferent and neutral toward them. . . . But it is not a light which men can put out; it is the sun on the horizon of the human race, ever ascending higher, breaking through all clouds, driving the night away, and after heavy storms shining

down upon the earth, mild, fructifying, vivifying, changing deserts and wildernesses into gardens of God.

K. Steiger: Augustine called the Holy Scriptures a garden in which he most loved to walk and botanize. Too many seek only poison-plants therein. I know not whether their intention is evil or whether such plants have a magnetic influence over them, chemical relationship with them. Others, who visit this garden, think they have advanced right far when they can give the names of the various growths, and can gather an herbarium of dry, colorless leaves.

Tholuck: What a book, in whose simple stories the child learns to love his Heavenly Father and to be pious, and in whose doctrines of God and man the latest systems of the philosophers have found the deep presentiments of philosophical truth: a book that is here full of intimations respecting metaphysical problems, there full of the tenderest mysticism of the feelings, again inexhaustible in truths of practical wisdom for our daily life; a book which gives us the key to the understanding of man, of the world and of God, and leads just as certainly to the founding of the true earthly happiness as the true salvation.

C. J. Nitzsch: Especially in the cultured classes, the delicate souls find a too great remoteness in the O. T. from the Christian view, as they have understood it, and fear to study it. We say confidently and can easily prove, that whoever cannot recognize the divine in the O. T., must temper very much the divine of the N. T. and for the most part neutralize the O. T. presupposition to which the N. T. is immediately joined. In the O. T. also the true, absolute religion is revealed, although in temporal, national bounds, so that first through the development of its germs it appears in all its divinity. The O. T. presents not only a firm, absolute, invincible *negation* to heathenism, but has also, like all powerful negations, a *positive* side and by virtue of this positiveness develops all the germs of the true idea of God, or presses from epoch to epoch toward the God, who is to be revealed in the flesh, also strives toward the knowledge and worship of God as triune. All the pinnacles of the O. T. representation touch Christianity: new covenant, appearance of Jehovah, great theophany, outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon all flesh.

Ebrard: Name to me the poet, the dramatist, the historian, who could produce such finely drawn characters as those which the Bible describes! Nay, name to me rather him, who presented such great, such colossal charac-

ters! Where is he? Where do you find him? O I will say naught of how the Holy Spirit breathes from the first page to the last, Holy Spirit, who calls the sin of the most exalted children of Adam sin and punishes it; I would have you concede much less than that: grant me only this, that in the Bible there is Spirit. And he who has not yet perceived the moving of the Holy Spirit in the Bible, he to whom this Book is not yet the fount of life and comfort and light and a rock and an anchor and one and all and God's Word—O let him recognize the fact, if he would not expose a certificate of poverty, that this is a book full of Spirit; I ask him just to read it as he would read a great poet; before he knows it, the poet will be transformed into a two-edged sword, which penetrates marrow and bone and censures the thoughts and purposes of the heart, his eyes will be opened, as were those of Ishmael's mother, and from the rock which he beheld that he might derive pleasure therefrom, will gush a fountain of living water, which allays the thirst of his soul forever.

Oosterzee: A book has been spread through the world, which cannot be compared even remotely with any other work of an earlier or later century. Ordered according to the need of each inhabitant of the earth, it is intended at the same time for all races, languages, peoples and nations. It has an altogether peculiar history, an altogether special character, and an all-surpassing value. Its first pages were written in the desert of Arabia and on the borders of Canaan; it was then continued in the palace at Jerusalem, in the school of the prophets at Rama or Jericho, afterward by the waters of Babylon, later in the prison-house at Rome; it was concluded on a distant island in the midst of the Aegean sea. When it began to be written, no philosophical or religious principle was composed in writing; when it was concluded, a new world had risen unto the place of the old; more than forty men differing in nature, training, descent—kings and shepherds, fishermen and tent-makers, publicans and physicians, prophets and priests, generals and the messengers of peace—have written, each in his own way, a greater or fewer number of those pages. And yet there originated from all these component parts an inimitable whole, that awakens, with each fresh contemplation, ever higher admiration. It has been transmitted from ancient times to the middle ages, from the middle ages to the present century, and for him, who rightly studies and values it, it seems as new as if it had been written but yesterday. Just as the Lord, of whom it testifies, it was



conceived by the Holy Ghost, gradually grew and its entrance into the world was endowed with the most unmistakable proofs of God's high favor. As He, it had to undergo conflict alternately with pharisaical haughtiness and sadducean levity, but only to conquer both. As He, it was summoned before hostile tribunals, accused by false witnesses, denied by weak friends, betrayed by dastardly servants, scourged by vulgar scoffers, condemned, died, was buried. . . . But even as He, it was awakened again after each ignominious condemnation and exalted after each fresh humiliation, although it also, as the Lord at His ascension, seems surrounded with a mysterious cloud. Yea, just as faith looked for the most splendid revelation of Christ's glory in the future, so also it exultingly looks forward to the time when this Book, coming forth unscathed by the hands of unbelief and doubt, will occupy before all eyes the wholly unique position which the God of truth has manifestly destined for it.

Schenkel: No thought is so deep, that it has not found the most childlike expression of popular simplicity. No pain has stirred so violently in the heart, for which there is not a word of relief and refreshment. The most ingenious teachings of wisdom, the most frightful examples of wickedness, the most exalted expressions of truth are here gathered; no crime is painted in fair colors, no praise overdone, no virtue flattered. The Holy Scripture is a coherent, continually growing organism, consisting of living members. As in the cathedrals of the middle ages, whose wonderful construction to-day yet fills our hearts with veneration and astonishment, careful contemplation reveals the fact that the most unimportant ornaments belong to the completeness of the whole and help to heighten the general effect, yea as even the powers of darkness must help support the slender arches and towers, so in the wonderful structure of the Holy Scripture the least serves the greatest and the powers of darkness, whose existence and expression of power the Scriptures reveal to us, are only the unwilling instruments, which must assist in the glorification of Him, in whom God has created the world and through whom He has redeemed it, in order to develop it finally into the finished temple of His heavenly kingdom. And as the ground-plan of those old cathedrals is as a rule the cross—so is also the cross of the atonement, which was accomplished by the Savior of the world, the ground-plan of the Holy Scriptures.

Delitzsch: The truth of the O. T. history is confirmed in this, that all its happenings have a starting-point and a

goal. Its starting-point is God's decree of redemption and its goal the realization of this decree. Christ is the centre about which this history revolves, in order finally to come to rest there and to discharge all its streams. Even the O. T. writings have this Christo-centric character. Its several constituent parts bear mutual testimony and form a harmonious whole, which, rendering a many-voiced witness to the idea of Christianity, work jointly toward its realization.

The same is true of the N. T. Scriptures, this monument of Christianity in its gradual, thoroughly founded coming into existence, this mirror of the incipient form of its conception. The compass of the N. T. is smaller than that of the O. T., and yet it contains 27 books from at least eight different authors—books which were written in different parts of Palestine and even in Rome and carry in themselves traces of the places where they originated; books in a Greek idiom, which presents the blending of oriental and occidental, of Israelitish and heathen elements and, so to speak, the introduction of Japhet into the tents of Shem; books from the most different departments of literature, from the historical through every variety of the epistolary to the future historical, apocalyptic; books of an altogether peculiarly sublime simplicity, lowly grandeur and superterrestrial beauty, which lack, however, almost everything that we are accustomed to admire in the works of classical, oriental and modern art; books whose authors, at least partly among their own people, were looked upon as duldards, and yet these books were irresistible in charm, of inexhaustible depth, admirable in design; books for the most part originating only occasionally, and yet of eternal, supreme importance; books, so small and yet so great, so imperfect in point of language and yet so beautiful, so child-like and stammering and yet so majestic, so full of stumbling-blocks and yet ever again triumphing over all doubt and censure.

Luthardt: The sacred literature can be ranked safely beside the literature of the cultivated world. Independent of its religious contents, only humanly considered, the Holy Scripture is the grandest literary work existing anywhere in the world—as great in its beauty and in the historical importance of its narratives, as in the fullness and depth of its thoughts, the power and variety of its language and the richness and beauty of its poetry. Long before Pindar in his triumphal songs celebrated the Olympian victors, David

had composed his Psalms, whose movement and power still refresh our souls. And long before Homer on the coasts of Asia Minor ravished the listening youth of his people by the deeds of the Trojan heroes, Moses and his sister had sung their song of conquest over the destruction of the Egyptian king, and Deborah, the woman-judge, had celebrated in the bold pictures of her imagination the victory of her people. When the foundation stones of the future world-capital, Rome, were being laid on the hills near the Tiber, Israel's prophets, their vision enlightened by the Spirit, surveyed the destinies of nations and foretold their future, and with power of speech far surpassing that of Demosthenes and with poetic flight far grander than that of Aeschylus, announced the judgments of God upon the sins of their people, or spoke of God's grace in words more sweet than the sweet words of a Sophocles. There is no sound in the scale of human feeling which has not found expression here, from the thorns of holy wrath or the heart-piercing laments of despair to the gentlest tones of mercy, or the most passionate songs of love. We retain in memory the names of the Seven Wise Men of Greece and treasure up their sayings. But what is the wisdom of these wise men compared with the treasure of wisdom for daily life as this is laid down in the proverbs of the O. T.? We sink ourselves into the depths of Platonic philosophy and admire the nobleness of its ideas. But the Scripture speaks of the world of eternal ideals as of the familiar home of its Spirit and expresses the deepest thoughts and the most comprehensive views with such certainty and simplicity, as if it dealt with the plainest truths of the world, or the most apparent statements which all know. Surely, even considered only humanly, the Scriptures tower far above all the literary productions of all nations and ages. Suppose we did not have the Bible and it were discovered today, perhaps in the corner of some library—we can well believe what a sensation this discovery would make! It would arouse the greatest attention that only a literary discovery can arouse, more than if Homer's songs or Shakespeare's dramas or Göthe's works were to appear suddenly for the first time. Men would speak of this wonderful book in all assemblies; men would found professorships for its explanation; it would belong to general culture to know it, to have read it, for it bears within itself a world of thought, it is a universe of the Spirit.

---

Here (in the Bible) is the common ground, upon which all classes and degrees of culture, from the highest to the lowest, meet. More than Homer among the Greeks the Bible twines a spiritual cord around all classes of our nation. And what a cord! Here we meet with the highest concerns of the soul, with the greatest questions of the mind, with the holiest feelings and thoughts. And this book it is which ever refreshes our soul anew, if we sink ourselves down into the book. It gushes forth like an eternally bubbling fountain in which our soul bathes. From the dissipation of the world, from the bustle of the day, from the conflict of our thoughts and feelings, we flee to it; here our soul becomes quiet, here the breath of eternity blows round us, here is the sanctuary of God. If we learn in the Scriptures to live, we will also learn to love the Scripture.

The more we lovingly sing ourselves into it and let it become the nourishment of our spirit, the more will it awaken in us the desire after the divine grace of which it testifies, and which comes nigh to us in the means of grace which the Church is called to administer; namely, in Word and Sacrament.

Fr. H. R. Frank: We do not say, that theology simply erred in seeking and finding in the Holy Scriptures the harmonious divine doctrine as expression of the truth of salvation; but it must be understood and practised *cum grano salis*, and only to him will that unity appear real and not forced, who seeks after the historical development, in which it works itself out, and concedes its claim. Of course, under these circumstances one must give up looking in every passage, in every stage, in every author of the Holy Scriptures to find a doctrine impressed with equal clearness, say in the O. T. doctrine of the Trinity or a clear picture of the God-man or the express declaration of the perfectness of the individual after death; similarly in the N. T., the same development of doctrine in Paul and in John, in these and in Peter or James; or the same photographic image of Christ's person in the four evangelists. But if one does not find fault with natural philosophy for trying to prove the same laws of physical life in the lower as well as in the higher grades of the natural forms of development, a truth deformed in Darwinism into caricature; how can men, with right, prohibit the Christian, in those manifold and at first sight disparate grades of the new creation, from availing themselves of the corresponding unity of the Spirit and

judging thereby the differences of the sacred authors? Criticism accuses Paul and his gospel of being contradictory to the O. T. Scripture and to the apostles of the circumcision; but criticism has thereby exhibited its incapability of comprehending the unity of the Spirit in the particular and in the universal, the limits between the one and the other, the need of the law for the gospel and the reverse, the word of Tertullian; knowledge has also in Christ its different ages. By contrast it may be easy to discover contradiction say between the knowledge in the two Testaments of the personal consummation of the man resting in God; but disposed of under the conception of the coming into existence of a new creation and the occasional attestation of this existence, the apparent contradiction disappears and the abridged as well as the expanded knowledge manifests itself as the effect of the one creative impulse. The expectation of the end as imminent both by the prophets and also by the N. T. writers compared with the fact of its delay produces the cheap conclusion that in this expectation those writers have erred; but when respect is had to the coming into existence of the new creation there appears in this much rather a harmonious law of the creative spirit, according to which from all points of the development an impulse is directed toward the end and expression is given to it under the conditions and within the limits of the course of development. Nothing is simpler than to observe the different ways in which the evangelists present the history of Christ; but the brilliance of this divine-human person is reflected differently according to the medium in which it is refracted, and in this difference there lies so little untruth, that much rather the objective truth with the fullness of its relations comes to light. For the matter is not this, that the difference is to be understood, and thus defended, as being purely subjective, in that far, also, infallible; but since the truth of redemption, which is personally present in the God-man, is only present for mankind in its manifold forms, connections and relations, it appears, objectively considered, as necessary, so that the in itself existing unity lives agreeably to this plurality, and thus comes to expression in the documental testimony. From this arises what has lately been denoted as the different "plan" of the gospels, whence the difference of their presentation results, an expression that is only a little one-sided, shifting the fact all too soon into the sphere of calculation, since the subjective design in the composition of

the evangelical material was not arbitrarily formed, but resulting from the real back-ground and only in that far justified. Add to this, that it is an a priori false apprehension of the historical objectivity, to find this only in the reproduction of the event exactly as it happened, so that each omission and each addition, each transposition and each abridgement would be instantly a corrupting of the historical truth. The photographic copy is not the only and absolutely true image; but there are pictures created by the artist that are inferior in outward objectivity to that photograph, and yet when the substance is had regard to, are truer and more objective than that. For to everything, that comes into this world under an earthly appearance, something accidental is affixed, whereby not seldom the essence is concealed rather than disclosed; whoever can strip this off, as a true artist shows us the essence in its truth. And we have no reason to make forthwith an exception to the history of Christ, who, although without sin, took to Himself our present humanity and so through the mediation of the same had to bring to expression the absolute truth of salvation. Thence it plainly follows, that when the holy writers do not adhere to that outward and only apparently sole, true objectivity, when, for example, they reproduce freely and compose in their own way the discourses of Christ or of other persons appearing in the sacred history, the Christian could, only in consequence of a misunderstanding look on this as an abandonment of the historical truth and thereby be led astray.

Vinet: The gospel, like the candles which, the higher they are, cast their shadows farther, is in proportion to its loftiness, dark and mysterious. Will you still be angry, because you do not understand everything in the gospel? Is it really matter of astonishment that you can not hold the ocean in the hollow of your hand, nor the uncreated wisdom within the limits of your understanding? Is it indeed deplorable that a finite being cannot comprehend the infinite, and that in the whole compass of things there are ideas beyond the power of comprehension? In other words, is it so much to be lamented that God knows something which man does not know?

Henry Ward Beecher: The Bible is the jewel, of which the whole creation is the setting.

Many passages of the Bible appear to me like flowers along the way. We have seen them our whole life long.

therefore we do not know and feel their beauty. Or they resemble the noble productions of art in the ancient cathedrals, which are covered with the dust and moss of age. Men go past them and do not know that their feet step upon figures which gave expression to the thoughts of the old masters. Nobody cares for them or cleans them, until some enthusiastic worshipper appears and does it, and then it becomes clear that the things which have remained unnoticed by them their life long are beautiful beyond description.

However unbelieving philosophers may consider the Bible matters not. Let them say that Genesis is wrong, the Psalms more than half embittered imprecations, the words of the prophets only fancies of crack-brained men, the gospels only weak attempts at praising a deceiver, the epistles only letters of foolish Jews, let them say that the whole book has had its day, I will cling to it until they show me a better revelation. The Bible empty, unfruitful, worn out! The wisest men of the earth may come one after the other, they cannot fathom the smallest depths of John's gospel. Ye philosophers, break through the shell, fly forth and let me hear how ye can sing. Tell me not of passion, I know that already, not of worldly power, I hear that everywhere, but let your song instruct me how to obtain joy amid cares, strength in weakness, light in the darkest days, how I can bear blows and scorn, how I can joyfully meet death, and how through its help I can joyfully enter the realm of eternal life, and this not only for myself, but for the whole world, which groans under labors and troubles; before you can do this, speak not to me of a better revelation.

Reville: One day in an assembly of earnest men the question was asked, what book a man, condemned to life-long imprisonment and to whom it was allowed to take with him into his cell one book only, would choose. Catholics, Protestants, philosophers, even materialists were together in the company. But all agreed in this, that the choice could fall only on the Bible.

Let the Bible remain then what it is, the imperishable monument of our religious beginnings and the best nourishment of reflective piety. It is from the Bible that the modern world in great part proceeds. Never has the Bible been the object of so severely penetrating criticism as in our days, never has its influence been greater and its propagation more active. It has been translated into more than

135 languages, and as formerly among the Goths through Ulfilas, it has created among more than one people an alphabet, and thus brought about reading and writing.

King Robert of Sicily to Petrarch: I assure thee, my dear Petrarch, that the sacred books are dearer to me than my kingdom, and were it necessary to part with one of both, it should certainly be with my crown.

Frederick the Wise: The letters of princes one should read twice. God's letter, daily.

The Holy Scriptures are so full of majesty and power that they demolish all our learned talking machines and force us to the conclusion that never did man so speak.

Gustavus Adolphus: I try by daily searching in the Word of God to arm myself against all temptations.

Napoleon I (according to Bertrand's Memoirs): The gospel possesses something powerfully effective, a warrant which at once influences the understanding and pervades the heart. The Bible is not a Book, but a living thing with an activity, a power to vanquish everything that opposes it. Here it lies upon the table, this Book of all books (at these words the emperor touched it with great reverence); I do not tire of reading it, and do so daily with the same pleasure. The soul ravished by the beauty of the gospel belongs no longer to itself; God possesses it wholly, controls its thoughts and every faculty; it is His.

Oxastiern: The art of living joyously and happily I have just now understood. My only pleasure which is of more worth to me than everything the world can give, is the knowledge of God's love and the reading of this glorious Bible-book. Surely, there is to be found more wisdom, comfort, truth and pleasure in a life consecrated to God and in reading His Word, than in all the courts and favors of princes.

Wilhelm von Humboldt: There can be no disposition of mind or feeling for which there is not corresponding expression in the Holy Scriptures. There is only little so difficult of understanding, that the simple mind cannot comprehend it. The man rich in knowledge only pushes in more deeply, but no one departs unsatisfied.

The reading of the Bible is an infinite and the safest fountain of comfort. I know of nothing else to be compared with it.

John von Müller to his friend Bonnet, 1782: Since I have been here I have read the ancients, without excepting one. I know not why it came into my head two months



since to take a glance or two into the N. T. before my studies had reached the period in which it was written. How can I express to you what I found therein!

I had not read it for many years, and before I picked it up, I was prejudiced against it. The light, which blinded Paul on his way to Damascus, was not more wonderful, more surprising than for me, when I suddenly discovered: the fulfillment of all hopes, the highest perfection of philosophy, the explanation of all revolutions, the key to all apparent contradictions of the physical and moral world, life and immortality. I beheld the most wonderful accomplished by the smallest means. I recognized the relations of all Asiatic and European revolutions to the miserable people, with which the promises were deposited as one commits important documents to some one who can neither read nor falsify them. I saw religion come forth in the moment favorable to its appearance, and in the manner which was most appropriate for its acceptance. The whole world seemed to me to be set in order to promote the religion of the Redeemer, and if this religion is not that of a God, I no longer understand anything. Formerly in my studies there was always something lacking, and only since I know the Lord, is everything clear before my eyes; with Him there is nothing, that I cannot solve. Pardon me, that I sing to you the praise of the sun, as a blind man would do, were the gift of sight suddenly bestowed upon him.

Niebuhr: For the exactness of the Biblical representations, the book of Jonah, among others, affords a brilliant proof. Several decades ago this book was ridiculed, yet now its narrative respecting Nineveh is fully confirmed by the recent discoveries with reference to the topography of this city.

Leopold Ranke: Even considered from our worldly standpoint we can say: there has been nothing on earth purer and stronger, nobler, holier than Christ's conversation, life and death. In each of His sayings there breathes nothing but the breath of God; as Peter expresses it, they are words of eternal life; the human race has no recollection which can even remotely be compared with this.

Wolfgang Menzel: The Bible-book is the book of books, the source of eternal life, of comfort and of strength for all the unhappy and troubled, a shield and weapon of innocence, an arouser of the spiritually sleeping, a guide out of the labyrinth of sin, a terrible judgment finally against those who persevere in sin. A book, whose like there is not upon earth, whose contents like the eye of God pierce

into the depths of the soul, wiser than all codes of laws, richer than all learned books, more beautiful than all the poesy of the world touching the heart more than a mother's words and yet on the other hand of such spiritual depth, that even the wisest does not exhaust it, open to the simplest and also lifting up and illuminating the most cultured and the noblest, a super-terrestrial light of more than solar power flashes through it, a breath of the eternal, awakening in the happy amid sweet earthly pleasure a deep homesickness and filling the suffering in their bitterest earthly need with unspeakable rapture, the Word from the beyond, before which Belshazzar trembled and before which even Paul was rendered speechless and blind, the Word which binds and loosens, kills and makes alive.

Rosseau St. Hilaire: Where the Bible does not form the corner-stone for the education of the whole life of society, there is no literature for children or for the people. Look at Spain, Italy, and even France, in a word all lands, in which the Bible is not read: nowhere is there anything for the children to read or for the workingman! In Germany, in England, on the other hand, there is a large amount of Christian literature for the youth and for the people, in which the national spirit reflects itself as in a glass.

Kepler: The day is near, when men will recognize the pure truth in the book of nature as well as in the Holy Scriptures and will rejoice over the harmony of the two revelations.

Isaac Newton: We should read the Scriptures, not as an advocate reads a testament merely to understand its meaning, but as an heir reads the description of his possession.

Blaise Pascal: Consider the wonders of the Holy Scriptures, which are innumerable, the superhuman greatness and loftiness of its contents and the wonderful simplicity of its style, which has nothing affected, nothing artificial about it and bears the unmistakable impress of the truth. The Holy Scripture is not a science of the mind, but of the heart. It is intelligible to those only who are of a pure, upright heart.

Hamann: Each individual cluster of grapes of the divine Word is a whole vineyard for the Christian. All wonders are daily occurrences, hourly experiences of the life in God.

Each word that proceeds out of the mouth of God, is a creation of thoughts and emotions in our soul.—Each Biblical narrative is a prophecy, which throughout all the

centuries and in the heart of each man is fulfilled. The Holy Scripture should be our dictionary and our grammar, upon which all Christians' ideas and discourses are founded and out of which they have their existence and form.

The Scripture can speak with us men in no other way than by parables, because all our knowledge is sensual, figurative, and reason ever makes the images of outward things signs of abstract, immaterial and higher ideas.

Nature and history are the two great commentaries on the divine Word and the latter on the other hand the only key for opening up to us a knowledge of both the former.

Kant: The Bible is the noblest treasure; without it I should be miserable. Reliable rules, by which men and even whole states can attain all possible happiness are to be found only in the Bible.

All the books which I have read have not given me the comfort which that word of the Bible, Ps. 23, 4, gave: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me."

In a letter to Stilling: Also in this you do well, that you find your only comfort in the Gospel, for it is the perennial fountain of all truth, which, if reason were to survey its whole field, could be found nowhere else.

Schelling: If the Bible and Shakespeare are left me, men can shut me up for years in a stronghold.

Fr. v. Bader: My whole life, all the working and moving of my spirit is: to think myself further into the thought of the Almighty, to submit myself to His—the heavenly—reason.

Dr. John Huber: In the literature of the world the Bible is without doubt the grandest work, with which no other religious book for the people can bear comparison; the religious being of mankind speaks to us in the same out of a past of thousands of years and still there are always words in it which can seize the human heart with deeply moving power. If in all the forms of civilization there moves a great tradition through history, and the present builds itself upon the broad basis of the labor of fallen races, so also the religious spirit of our age will be able to look in this book back into its history, and to draw therefrom manifold nourishment. Not without reason has Schleiermacher, the delicate-feeling student and friend of Plato, prized the Gospel of John so highly; it can indeed well stand beside the dialogues of the Greek philosopher and it offers elevation and refreshment not always to be found in those. Also Kant, no friend of Judaism, and of a cool disposition in

spiritual things, designated the Bible as a book, which because of the divinity of its moral contents sufficiently indemnifies reason for the humanity of the historical narrative.

Walter Scott: Precious Bible! There is nothing that it does not offer, nothing that it does not give the man that feels his need and seeks its riches; truth, that never grows old, joy, that never surfeits, a crown that never rusts, soothing our grief and quieting our fear, happy hope and eternal life is the gift of God to all who love and reverence His Word.

Byron: In this grand book (the N. T.) rests the mystery of all mysteries. Happy are those, to whom God has given the grace to understand this Holy Book.

J. J. Rosseau: I confess to you that the majesty of the Holy Scriptures fills me with astonishment. The holiness of the Gospel speaks to my heart. Behold the books of the philosophers in all their pride, how small they are beside this book! Is it possible that a work, equally exalted and plain comes from men? Is it possible that he whose history it contains, is only a man? Is this the tone of an enthusiast or of an ambitious founder of a sect? What gentleness, what purity in His life! What loftiness in His maxims! What deep wisdom in His discourses! What presence of the Spirit, what refinement and excellence in His answers! What mastery over His passions! (?) Where is the person, the wise man, who knows how to act, to suffer and to die without weakness and bragging? When Plato paints his ideal of a righteous man, who is covered with all the shame of transgression, but is worthy of the praise that belongs to every virtue, he delineates Jesus Christ step by step; the resemblance is so striking, that all the church-fathers have remarked it. What prejudice, what blindness, to dare to compare the son of Sophroniskus with the Son of Mary! What a wide distance between the two! Socrates, dying without pain, without disgrace, played his part through to the end without labor, and had not this easy death brought honor to his life, one could doubt whether, with all his ability, he was more than a sophist. It is said: He devised morality. Others practiced morality, from their examples he developed only his teachings. Aristides was righteous before Socrates defined what righteousness was; Leonidas died for his fatherland, before Socrates inculcated patriotism as a duty; before he gave a definition of virtue, Greece had an abundance of virtuous men. But whence from among His people did Jesus

take this lofty and pure morality, which He alone practiced and taught? From the lap of the wildest fanaticism there was drawn forth the highest wisdom, and the simplicity of the most heroic virtues threw lustre upon the most despised among all nations. The death of Socrates, who died peacefully, philosophizing with his friends, is the easiest that one could wish for; the death of Christ, on the other hand, who expired in agony, despised, derided, cursed by a whole nation, this death is the most horrid and fearful. Socrates, when he receives the poisoned draught, blesses the man who, weeping, hands him the cup; Jesus prays for his furious, hating executioners amid the most dreadful torments. Yea, if the life and the death of Socrates are the life and death of a wise man, the life and the death of Christ are the life and death of a God. Will it be said that the history of the Gospel has been invented for gratification? Thus men do not invent, and the deeds of Socrates, which nobody questions, are less attested than those of Jesus Christ. At bottom that is shoving the difficulty aside without disturbing it; it would be more incomprehensible that several men had unanimously manufactured this book than it is that one person furnished the material. Never would other Jews have found this morality, and the Gospel has such great, such surprising, such wholly inimitable, true characters, that, if they were not true, their inventor would be more marvellous than the hero.

Diderot: Let the position of this book be what it will, I freely acknowledge this as due the truth, that I know of nobody, neither in France nor anywhere else in the world, who could write and speak with more skill and talent than the fishermen and publicans, who have here written these narratives. I venture to affirm that no one of us is capable of writing, even in an approximate manner, a narrative which is so simple and yet so exalted, so fresh and touching and of such powerful effect on the soul and of such unimpaired influence, even after centuries, as each particular, even most insignificant report concerning the suffering and death of Jesus Christ stands before us.

Lessing: Milton's *Paradise Lost* is therefore not less the first epic after Homer, because it presents few pictures, than is the passion-history of Christ a poem because one can hardly set down the head of a needle upon it without striking a passage, which could not have occupied a multitude of the greatest artists. The evangelists relate the fact with all possible bare simplicity, and the artist uses its

manifold parts, without its having shown the least ray of the genius of painting.

If there can be and must be a revelation, and the right one has once been discovered: it must be to our reason rather a proof for the truth of this revelation than an objection against it, if things are found therein that surpass our understanding. Whoever polishes these things out of his religion, has as good as none. For what is a revelation which reveals nothing? Is it enough if one retains the name, although the substance has already been rejected?—A certain being taken captive under the obedience of faith by no means rests on this or that passage of Scripture: but on the essential idea of a revelation.—Or much rather,—for the word being taken captive seems to denote force on the one hand, and resistance on the other—reason gives itself up; its surrender is nothing else than the confession of its limits, so soon as it is assured of the reality of a revelation.

Hippel: The Bible is in itself plain and reasonable; whoever explains the Bible otherwise than by the Bible, is a hireling.

Seume: Do not spin dissension out of the Holy Scriptures' message of peace.

Boss: The Bible furnishes us a triumphal song.

Herder: It shall happen in the future that the Bible will become the simple history and wisdom of our race. The lean Bible will swallow all the seven sciences of the old and the thousand of the new world, like Pharaoh's fat kine; and then there will be want until a day comes, which will open everything through *facta* and *acta*. As a child hearkens to the voice of its father, as the lover listens for the voice of his bride, so should we hear God's voice in the Scriptures and receive the sound of eternity, that peals forth from it.

Lavater: He who would abide in Jesus' teaching and remain His firm disciple, must daily exercise himself in small things in order to show his fidelity to the Word of the Lord.

Matthias Claudius: What thou canst see, that see, and use thy eyes; and respecting the invisible, and eternal hold thee to God's Word. Of all disputants, those, who hold to the Bible and yet explain everything supernatural naturally and border and harmonize it with their philosophy, are undeniably the weakest, for they have neither understanding nor heart, and are neither fish nor flesh. Moreover they are ever in need and do not reach the goal, for it is much harder to preserve reason against revelation

than revelation against reason; and when they arrive at the goal, they have nothing.

He who will not believe in Christ, must see how he can get along without Him. I and thou can not do it. We need somebody to lift and hold us up, while we live, and to lay a hand under our head when we must die; and this He can do abundantly, according to that which is written of Him, and we know of none from whom we would rather have this service. No one has ever so loved, and such goodness and greatness, as the Bible says and declares of Him, has never come into the heart of any man and beyond all his merit and worth. It is a holy form which ascends like a star in the night for the poor pilgrim and fills his inmost need, his most secret longing and desire. And now a Savior from every need, from all evil. A Redeemer from the wrong! And now a helper, as the Bible presents the Lord Christ, who went about and did good and Himself had not where to lay His head; through whom the lame were made to go, the lepers were cleansed, the deaf heard, the dead stood up and the poor had the gospel preached to them; to whom wind and sea were obedient, who caused the little children to come unto Him, took them up in His arms and blessed them; who was with God and was God, and could have had joy, but thought of the wretched in prison and came to them clad in the uniform of wretchedness in order to make them free with His blood; who regarded not the toil and the pain and was patient even to the death upon the cross, that He might finish His work;—who came into the world to save the world, was slain and martyred in the world and passed from it crowned with thorns!

Hast thou ever heard anything similar, and do not thy hands fall helpless at thy side? It is truly a mystery, and we comprehend it not; but the fact comes from God and out of heaven, for it bears heaven's seal and drops with God's mercy.—Whoever has his heart in the right place will lie in the dust and exult and worship.

Goethe: That great reverence which is paid to the Bible by many nations and races of the earth is due to its inner worth. It is not only a book of one nation, but a book of the nations, because it sets forth the destinies of one nation as a symbol of all the rest, joins the history of that nation to the origin of the world and through a graded order of earthly and spiritual developments, of necessary and accidental developments, leads into the remotest regions of the remotest eternities.

The higher centuries ascend in culture, the more is the Bible used, partly as foundation, partly as means of training, of course not by the curious, but by the truly wise men. In all four gospels the glory of a supreme power is active, which proceedeth from the person of Christ and which is of such divine character as only the divine can appear upon earth.

Let intellectual culture make constant progress, and the physical sciences ever increase in extent and depth and the human mind expand itself as it will—it can never reach above the height and moral culture of Christianity, as this shines forth in the Gospels.

For my person, I hold the Bible dear and precious; for almost to it alone did I owe my moral training. And the events, doctrines, symbols, parables, all deeply impressed themselves on me and became effective in one way or another. Therefore the unjust, scornful attacks and misrepresentations displeased me.

I am convinced that the Bible ever becomes more beautiful, the more one understands it, i. e., one discovers that each word, which we comprehend in general and apply to ourselves in particular, has had according to certain surroundings, relations of time and place, an own, special, immediately individual reference.

There was a time when kings and statesmen took lessons in this book of the nations from the humblest peasant, not only to seek rest for the soul therein, but to find the eternal laws divinely appointed for nature.—Childlike simplicity soonest understands the divine meaning in that book; and after wandering through all the by-ways, the wisest and most experienced return to it with reverence.

Schiller: Even now it is the prevailing opinion that wit should sparkle at the expense of religion, so that one hardly passes for a genius any longer unless he casts his godless satire upon religion's most sacred truths. The noble simplicity of the Scriptures must in the daily assemblies of the so-called wits be abused and distorted into the ridiculous; for what is so holy and earnest, that can not, if falsely distorted, be made sport of?—I do hope that I have not procured for religion and true morality any vulgar revenge, when I deliver up in the person of my most infamous robbers these malicious enemies of the Scriptures to the detestation of the world.

Lenan:

Hab ich verworfen auch die Schrift,  
Ihr Anblick noch das Herz mir trifft;



Durch die mir einst so teuren Zeilen  
 Hör ich die Winde blätternd eilen;  
 Sie wecken, wie sie drüber fahren,  
 Mir Klänge aus vergangnen Jahren:  
 Als ob die Bibel mahnend wehte  
 An's Herz mir Psalmen und Gebete  
 In wunderbaren Sehnsuchtsklängen,  
 Fühl' ich darin ein bang Bedrängen.

Heine: How often I think of the history of the Babylonian king, Nebuchadnezzar, who took himself for God, but pitifully fell from the height of his arrogance, crawled upon the ground like a beast and ate grass. This story is recorded in the magnificent book of Daniel, and I recommend it to the hearty consideration not only of the good Ruge, but also of my much more hardened friend Marx, as also the Herren Teuerbach, Daumer, Bruno Bauer, and whatever their names may be, these godless self-worshippers. There are many more beautiful and remarkable narratives in the Bible which would be worthy of their notice, for instance, right at the beginning the story of the forbidden tree in Paradise and of the serpent, the little private tutor, which six thousand years before Hegel's birth propounded Hegel's philosophy. This spy without feet showed with great acuteness, how the absolute consists in the identity of being and cognition, how man becomes God through knowledge, or, which is the same, how God comes to a consciousness of Himself in man.

After moving my whole life through all the ball-rooms of philosophy, giving myself up to all the orgies of the soul, courting all possible systems, without being satisfied,—now I suddenly discover myself on the same place where Uncle Tom stands, on the foundation of the Bible, and I kneel down beside this black, devout brother with the same reverence.

Auerbach: It is more than mere accident that with the Bible the New High German language first became settled. The Bible both according to contents and form became the codex of the new literature and influenced especially the peculiar character of the German popular literature. The Spirit of the Bible is the most intelligible and most national, references to biblical stories and figures are generally accepted as a matter of course. Altogether regardless of its theological importance, considered from a purely aesthetic standpoint, the Bible still remains the pattern of a popular book.—In the Bible the original form and primary

lines of the human soul-life are given ; we have ever to learn therefrom.

Bozumil Golz : It is the breath of God that rushes in the Holy Scriptures like the harp and the organ's peal. The Scriptures stand forth like an obelisk covered hieroglyphics, or a mount Ararat from the flood of literatures of all times.

Christopher von Schmid : Among all stories the Biblical are the most excellent. There everything lives, everything stands before the eyes, the scene of the history is always defined. We are everywhere in the real world, have mountain and valley, tree, rock, springs and mountain ranges about us. The time of the story is given : now it is morning, now evening, again warm mid-day. It is harvest time, sheep shearing time, or the time for gathering the vintage. In these stories there shines a sun, stars twinkle, the rainbow appears. Here is a corn-field, there a vineyard, and over there an olive-garden. Nature is peopled with living creatures, which are described according to their character. With all its circumstantiality the Biblical narrative does not decline into the petty. Sunrise and landscape are not described, by which the progress of the story is only supported. The persons engaged are not phantoms ; they are men that speak and act as we do. All are taken from real life ; they are presented in their agricultural and domestic occupations, they are introduced as speaking. They do not speak the book language, however, but that of the heart and of nature, chiefly in short words, which perfectly express the state of the mind. The gestures are often more expressive than the words. The characterization is unsurpassed, full of naturalness and truth, embraces at times also the outward form as in the case of Esau, Joseph, David, etc. But what makes the narrative more interesting is the wonderfulness of the events, the strikingness of the situations, the dramatic progress of the treatment.

## PRISCA THE AUTHOR OF HEBREWS.

Professor Harnack, in the first issue of the new bi-monthly of his pupil, Dr. Erwin Preusschen, "*Die Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*" (Giessen, Ricker) has advanced the novel theory that the greatest degree of probability in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews points to Prisca or Priscilla and her husband, Aquila, as the joint authors of this letter, and the former as the chief writer. The brilliant Berlin savant does not profess to have discovered any historical evidence connecting directly or indirectly these names with the composition of this letter. His argument is based entirely upon a comparison of the facts as presupposed by the character and contents of this letter with the facts that we know chiefly from the New Testament in reference to this noteworthy couple. There has been a somewhat noteworthy change in opinion in regard to the readers presupposed by this writing in recent years. Largely through the influence of Zahn the conviction has gained a firm hold that these "Hebrews" constituted a small circle of converts within the broader company of Christians at Rome, and Harnack, especially on the basis of a keen analysis of the "I" and "We" statements of the Epistle has endeavored to determine the relation existing between the author and his readers. While Zahn still accepted the well known sentiment of Origen, that God only knew the truth as to the authorship of Hebrews, Harnack is convinced that the position and standing of Prisca and Aquila in the primitive Church together with some other historical facts makes it probable that the letter came from them. On the basis of the passages Acts 18, 2, 18, 26; Rom. 10, 3; 1 Cor. 16, 19; 2 Tim. 4, 19 he draws attention to the fact that this remarkable couple were prominent teachers in the early Church, being largely instrumental in the conversion of even so finished a scholar as Apollo; that "all the Gentile churches" were indebted to them (Rom. 16, 4) and that accordingly their activity must have been œcumenical in extent, their activity as evangelists in Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome being especially prominent. Their expulsion from Rome by Claudius first led them to the Gospel, and when after their return and activity in that city they again left, their absence gave them the opportunity for the letter to the Hebrews, addressed by one of the members to a smaller circle of intimate co-laborers and co-believers. As in five cases out of six the name

of Prisca is mentioned before that of her husband, we have reason to believe that the wife was the more active and prominent of the two. If she had the chief part in the composition of the letter, or was the sole author, the total loss of all remembrance of the writer by even the earliest tradition is all the more easily explained. Beginning with Paul the early Church developed considerable opposition to the activity of women in the work of the Church, and the intentional suppression of the fact that a woman was the author of a leading New Testament Epistle was only too natural in those times. Besides, a comparison of the several revisions of the Acts shows that there was made, in the early period a determined effort to discredit the prominence of Prisca's work, and that actually a letter written by her was denied her by later tradition. In a series of eight propositions the various steps of this argument are developed by Harnack, in a manner that shows skillful combinations. But naturally he rejects "To the Hebrews" as the original heading of the letter, as also does Zahn and others; and even insists that the recipients of the letter were not to be regarded necessarily as consisting chiefly of converts from Judaism. Harnack frankly acknowledges that his argument has no absolutely convincing force, and accordingly heads his article "Probabilia;" but he has made a brilliant plea for a new explanation of an old problem. His idea has as good or better foundation than the random guesses made of Barnabas, Apollo, Luke or Clement.

---

## NOTES.

A FURTHER fragment of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus has been found by E. R. Adler, who reports the particulars in the *Athenaeum*. This remnant evidently belongs to the collection of manuscripts belonging to the Ginezah in Cairo and seems to belong to the manuscript of the Cambridge edition. At any rate it exactly fills out the lacuna of that manuscript, namely from VII, 29 to XII, 1. This unexpected discovery justifies the hope that the whole text will yet be discovered. These at least are the expectations of no less an authority than Nöldeke, in his essay on the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus in *Stade's Zeitschrift*, 1900, No. 1.

THE Academic Senate of the University of Athens, in a recent extraordinary session decided to arrange for an international archæological congress to be held either this fall or next spring in that city. All the leading universities, academies of science and archæological institutes of the world are to be invited to send representatives, also the foreign institutes in Athens of which the German has recently celebrated its twenty-fifth and the French its fiftieth anniversary.

---

SOME BIBLICAL PROBLEMS. — The latest issue of the *Journal of the German Palestine Society* (Vol. 22, 1 and 2, Leipzig, Baedeker), a solid double number of 104 pages, discusses an unusual list of Biblical problems. The late Professor Socin gives a new version of the famous Soloam inscription, next to the Mesha Stone the oldest Hebrew inscription extant, with a new translation. Dr. Hermann Christ, of Basel, takes up the vexed question as to the identification of the lily of the Bible, with the rather disappointing conclusion that its identity cannot at present be established with absolute certainty, and that under no circumstances it can be the ordinary white lily, as has recently again been claimed with considerable force. Architect Conrad Schick, who has been a resident and a student of the topography of Jerusalem for more than fifty years, discusses the question as to the birthplace of John the Baptist. He decides against the opinion of many moderns, who find this in Jutta, but defends the traditional Ain Karim, a village about five miles west of Jerusalem. The same scholar devotes a second article to the question of the gate through which Christ entered into the sacred city on Palm Sunday, and does so because the Savants in charge of the program of the German emperor's entrance a year ago proceeded on the supposition that this must have been the Hulda gate. Schick, for topographical reasons, insists that this is a mistake, and that the true entrance gate is the other temple and double gate, namely, the so-called Golden Gate. These articles are all rich in detail discussions for the special student.

# MODEL SERMONS. SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, \$2.50; half leather, \$3.00; half morocco, \$4.00;  
Imitation morocco, two volumes, \$4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

By DR. C. H. L. SCHUETTE.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship 'with understanding;' and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, \$1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five. "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## THE MEANS OF GRACE

BY REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

# Columbus Theological Magazine.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim is the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

Friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as circumstances permit.

The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

Terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers, 35 cents.

Contributions should be addressed to LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, Columbus, Ohio.

All communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges should be sent to GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., Columbus, Ohio.

Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28.

## THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

ITS FOUNDATION, ESSENCE, APPEARANCE AND WORK.

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Inspired by the purest motive, the desire to serve his Master by being helpful fellow-laborers, fully conscious that the unscriptural views on the subject endanger the soul and should be exposed, and confident "that the King will accompany it with a blessing," the author wrote and published this work.

This work is notable for its comprehensive and yet simple analysis of its subject, its earnest devotion to the practical topics and problems that spring out of the life at every point." — *Lutheran Church Review*.

This work is carefully prepared and well written. — *Lutheran Observer*.

The book contains 364 pages and sells for \$1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

No Theological Library Complete Without It.

## THE ERROR OF MODERN MISSOURI:

ITS INCEPTION, DEVELOPMENT, AND REFUTATION.

AS SET FORTH IN

the Present Controversy on Predestination; A Contribution to its History and Proper Estimate. By F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.

Intuitu Fidei." By REV. F. A. SCHMIDT, D. D.

Testimony Against the False Doctrine of Predestination Recently Introduced by the Missouri Synod. By Several Former Members of the Missouri Synod.

EDITED BY GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

The subject matter discussed in these several treatises is vast and varied. Dr. C. Huette, President of Ev. Luth. Synod, has the following to say with reference to it: "Suffice it to say that the erudition, assiduity and conscientiousness of the authors, and of the translators as well, are the best guarantee any one can ask for. The book herewith recommended is a treasury of profound thought, nice reasoning and rich information. May it find its way into the hands of many readers and prove a lasting good to them and through them to the Church at large."

The book contains 800 large octavo pages and sells for \$2.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL  
DEVOTED TO THE INTER-  
ESTS OF THE EVANGEL-  
ICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH

*Edited by the Theological Faculty of Capital University*

**VOL. XX**

**OCTOBER 1900**

**No. 5**

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. Briefly explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D. . . . .	257
THE CENTRAL THEOLOGICAL PROBLEM OF THE DAY. By Professor George H. Schodde, Ph. D. . . . .	267
ELOCUTION FOR PREACHERS OR PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Rev. E. G. Tressel, A. M. . . . .	274
PASTORAL VISITATION OF THE SICK. By Rev. Walter L. Spielman, A. B. . . . .	278
PUNERAL SERMON. By Rev. L. H. Schuh, Ph. D. . . . .	286
THE CONVERTING GRACE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE TRANSITIVE CONVERSION OF THE SINNER. By Rev. Paul S. L. Johnson, A. B. . . . .	289
RECENT BIBLICAL RESEARCH. By Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph. D. . . . .	312

**LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN**

**55-57-59 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, OHIO**



# THE TEACHERS' ANNUAL

FOR THE YEAR 1900.

The Sunday School Lessons for the whole year explained in language within the grasp of every teacher. The author's object is to make the text of the lessons plain. A judicious use of the "Annual" will richly repay anyone, whether teacher or not.

Price, in substantial board binding, per copy, 75 cents. In lots of six or more, 60 cents per copy, payable in advance. Postage 7 cents extra.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY DR. F. W. STELLHORN,

Professor of Theology in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

A popular treatise on the four Gospels. For study and devotion. Gives the meaning of the text, the history of prominent persons mentioned in the gospels, the topography, all in a clear and distinct manner. The highest praise has been bestowed upon this commentary by able and competent critics.

Plain Cloth, \$2.00; Half Leather, \$2.50; Morocco, \$3.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY

OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

BY HEINRICH SCHMID, D. D.

Text-Book. The Lutheran Doctrine in a clear, distinct and comprehensive form.

Bound Durably in Elegant Cloth, \$4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIES

Ministers and Teachers and Professors will find it to their advantage to consult the General Catalogue of the Lutheran Book Concern before purchasing what they need for their libraries. It cannot be expected that all the books mentioned could be constantly on hand, but the assurance can be given that all orders will be promptly attended to.

---

## CHURCH RECORDS

Every congregation should keep a complete record of all the pastoral acts and important events occurring in the congregation. To this end *Church Records* are necessary. The LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN has them for sale at \$3.75.

---

**IN ONE VOLUME** are the works of able and competent authors on Theological and Practical subjects, covering a large field. We have bound volumes of the COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, from 2 to 19, bound durably in half roan at \$2.00 per volume. Order complete set and we will furnish same at \$1.50 per volume.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XX.

OCTOBER, 1900.

No. 5.

## THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,  
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

### CHAPTER XIV.

#### *C. The Example of Christ a Motive: Vv. 1-13.*

Since the weak Christians are in danger of losing their faith if they accomodate themselves to the practice of the stronger brethren without possessing their strength of faith (14, 23), it is evidently the duty of the latter, to bear the manifestations of the formers' weakness, however disagreeable and burdensome that sometimes may be, and not to look simply to what is pleasing to themselves (1). Rather should everyone strive to do what is pleasing to his neighbor, provided that it is for his real good and tends to promote his growth in Christian faith and life (2). In this respect we ought to follow the example of Christ who did not look to what could be pleasing to Him, but according to the prophecy contained in the Scriptures of the Old

V. 1. Ὁφείλομεν: emphatic: it is our duty, our moral obligation over against 14, 22 sq. Τὰ ἀσθενήματα: the manifestations of being weak in faith (14, 1). Ἀδύνατοι: not able to do what the strong in faith can do. Βαστάζειν suggests the idea of a load or burden. "Not to please ourselves": not to seek our own gratification (comp. 1 Cor. 10, 33); ἑαυτοῖς=ἑμὶν αὐτοῖς (as the general reflexive pronoun).

V. 2. Ἀρροσέτω: of course not in the sense of Gal. 1, 10, hence modified by the prepositional clauses following, of which the second again explains the first. The prepositions are synonymous: εἰς unto, πρὸς for (comp. 3, 25. 26.) "Edification"; comp. 14, 19.

Vol. XX. 17

Testament patiently bore the revilings and persecutions of those who in their blindness opposed and reviled the plan of salvation laid down by God Himself (3; comp. Psalm 79, 9). For all that is contained in the Bible, though written long before our times, is intended also for our instruction, in order that the power of patient endurance and the comfort which the Holy Scriptures as the living Word of God contain and bestow, may enable us to have and retain that hope which is the joy of a Christian in the midst of all affliction and trouble (4). And only when God, the ultimate source and author of this endurance and hope, bestows it through His word, brotherly harmony and unselfish love according to the example of Christ is possible (5), and will manifest itself in the unanimous and common praise of the true God who sent His only Son to become our Savior and Redeemer (6). And in order that this desirable end may be attained, we should receive and treat

---

V. 3. David, the author of Psalm 69, from which the citation is taken, was a type of Christ; hence what he here says of himself was fulfilled in a still greater degree in Christ. After *ἀλλά* the Apostle simply cites the words literally, instead of giving them in indirect speech by changing *σε* to *θεόν* and *ἐμέ* to *αὐτόν*, which adds life and force to the expression.

V. 4. *Γάρ*: proof that the Apostle is right in making use of that passage of the Old Testament, since he had not pointed to the example of Christ as such but as predicted in the words of Holy Writ. *Τῶν γραφῶν* belongs to both preceding genitives which by the repetition of *διά* before the second are emphatically coordinated. *Τήν ἐλπίδα*: the well-known one of a Christian. The Apostle here speaks of the conduct in trouble and adversity in general, though not without reference to the difficulties incurred by bearing the weak in faith.

V. 5. The Apostle goes back to verse 1, connecting with it the last thought of verse 4, and adding a heartfelt wish. *Δέ* marks the transition (comp. verse 13). *Δύη* is a rarer form for *δοίη* (opt. aor. 2). "To think, to have in mind, the same thing among one another": to be harmonious and unselfish in your mutual relation and communion (comp. 12, 16). The common hope, the result of patient endurance and comfort, is a strong bond of unity (Eph. 4, 3-sq.). "According to Jesus Christ": according to His example (verse 3) and His will.

V. 6. "With one mind," or heart, unanimously, is the source of "in, or with, one mouth." Herein the unity of the Church especially manifests itself. *Τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα κτλ.*: "Him who is the (true) God and (at the same time) the Father of our Lord,

each other as brethren, just as Christ has received us and treats us as His own for the purpose of glorifying God by the gathering of a Church of His children (7; comp. Eph. 1, 12). For when Christ in the first place came to serve the people of Israel as their promised Messiah (Matt. 15, 24; 20, 28), this inured to the praise and glory of the truthfulness of God who now fulfilled His gracious promises given to the patriarchs (8); and when the heathen also were admitted to the kingdom of God, they could not but praise and glorify the sheer mercy of God who gave them what had not been promised them in a special covenant, though it was in accordance with manifold prophecies which stated that the glorious revelation of God's grace and mercy would be praised also among the heathen (9; comp. Psalm 18, 50); that the heathen would rejoice at the grace of

etc." The one article unites the two nouns to denote one person, and only "Father", not "God", is to be construed with "of our Lord, etc". That He is not only the true God but also the Father of our Redeemer, that is what moves us to praise and glorify Him. Comp. 2 Cor. 1, 3; 11, 31; Eph. 1, 3; Col. 1, 3; 1 Pet. 1, 3;—Eph. 5, 20.

V. 7. *Διό*: to attain the end mentioned in verse 6. "Receive one another": addressed to both parties, though perhaps especially to the strong in faith to whom the preceding verses were addressed. Compare also 14, 1. "To the honor of God": as explained in verses 8 and 9.

V. 8. "For. I mean this", namely, by the last clause of the preceding verse (comp. 1 Cor. 1, 12; Gal. 4, 1; 5, 16). *Διὰ ζῶνον γεγ. περ.*: emphatic to show the God-given dignity of the Old Testament people of the covenant. *Διὰ ζῶνον*: has the main stress: one who served them and ministered unto them (not *δοῦλον*: bond-servant; for Christ was at the same time their Lord who out of grace served them). "Circumcision": abstract for concrete; without the article to emphasize the quality: circumcised people who by circumcision were in the covenant with God. "For the truth of God": in order to manifest and prove it; explained by the next clause. Comp. 2 Cor. 1, 20. *Τῶν πατέρων*: gen. obj. given to the fathers.

V. 9. With the heathen it was different: *δέ*. Whilst God was bound by His truthfulness to fulfill the promises given Israel, what He did for the heathen was sheer mercy; though it also was nothing but mercy that prompted Him to make those promises in the first place. "For, on account of, mercy": emphatic, in opposition to "for the truth of God." The two *ὅπερ* have not the same meaning, because of the different connection in which

God together with the true Israelites (10; comp. Deut. 32, 43; Rom. 9, 6); that all nations without any exception were to praise the God of love and salvation (11; comp. Psalm 117, 1); and that the shoot out of the root of Jesse, the great Son of David, would come to rule in grace and mercy also over the heathen, and that heathen would rest their hope of salvation in Him (12; comp. Isa. 11, 10; Matt. 12, 21). In connection with this hope, whose realization is to be subserved by the brotherly conduct of his readers, the Apostle adds the wish that God, who alone can work and realize that hope, may fill them with the greatest spiritual joy and peace (14, 17), founded in their faith in Christ, in order that thus by the power of the Holy Ghost abundance of hope may be found in them; for in faith we have everything: joy, peace, the Holy Ghost, and hope (13).

they stand. As to the relation of Jews and gentiles respecting the promises and the Gospel comp. 1, 16; 11, 17 sqq.; Acts 13, 46. "Therefore": belongs to the citation and hence need not be interpreted. In the citation the subject "I" is David, in the New Testament fulfilment no definite person is meant: that God is praised also among the heathen is emphasized.

V. 10. *Λέγει*: scil. ἡ γραφή, to be supplied from *γέγραπται*. A literal citation of the Septuagint version which departs from the Hebrew original, without, however, materially changing the sense, the original meaning, "Rejoice, nations, or heathen, (being) His people," and thus still more clearly predicting the conversion of the gentiles, in the form of a commandment.

V. 11. Likewise a citation of the Septuagint version. *Αἰνέω* and *ἐπαινέω* differ as the German *loben* and *beloben*, the second being the intensified form. The "peoples" (*λαοί*) of course include the "gentiles" (*ἔθνη*).

V. 12. Again a literal citation of the Septuagint deviating from the original but not changing the main idea. "The root": ἡ ρίζα = *שׁרשׁ*: here the shoot growing up from the root. Christ, being the descendant of David and Jesse, can be called the latter's root or shoot, like His royal ancestor and type, David. The *καί* before *ὁ ἀνίστάμενος* is explanatory=namely. *Ἐπ' αὐτῷ*: upon Him their hope will rest, be based. The omission of the article before *ἔθνη* here as before, in verses 9 and 10, emphasizes the quality: men that are heathen, not Israelites by descent.

V. 13. *Δέ* again marks the transition to a prayerful wish (comp. verse 5), which concludes the section beginning 14, 1. Here, as in verse 5, the wish is linked to the last clause of the

#### IV. CONCLUSION (XV. 14- XVI. 27.)

##### *A. The Apostle Justifies His Writing: Vv. 14-21.*

From what the Apostle knows concerning the Christians at Rome, without being dependent on the corresponding testimony of others, he is convinced that they do not need the teaching of anybody, having a full measure of excellent qualities and being especially endowed with all necessary knowledge in matters spiritual, so that they are able also to give to one another the needed admonition (14). Still he has written to them in part more boldly than perhaps would be expected under such circumstances, very earnestly and solemnly exhorting and admonishing them (e. g. 6, 12 sqq.; 11, 17 sqq.; 12, 3; 13, 3 sqq.; 14, 3 sqq.); but this he has done simply as one who would remind them of what they already know, something a Christian because of the weakness of his flesh always stands in need of. And what gave him a special right to do this was his office of an apostle (15; comp. 1, 5 sq.; 12, 3) by virtue of which he was a minister of Christ for the heathen in particular, it being his duty to administer and preach the Gospel of God in a priestly way, namely, so that the heathen might become an offering to God that was acceptable to Him, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost who wrought in

---

preceding verse but turned in a somewhat peculiar direction. "With all joy"—with the greatest possible joy. That spiritual joy and peace are meant follows from their being founded in faith; hence peace between brethren is not here referred to directly. "The hope" is the Christian hope of salvation.

V. 14. *Δέ* leads over to a new section, as distinct from the previous one of practical admonitions. "My brethren": comp. 10, 1. Here an expression of Paul's love for them. "Also I myself": *αὐτός* has the main emphasis, denying the necessity of depending on the good opinion held by others, the existence of which is indicated by *καί*. "Goodness": excellent qualities in general. The two following clauses mention something special, the second stating something dependent on the first.

V. 15. "In part": a modification of the preceding expression. To the explanation of the latter as given above may be added that the Roman congregation was not founded by Paul, which fact also might have been supposed to cause him to write more mildly. "As reminding you"; as one would do who wanted to remind you.

them faith and love (16). Hence the Apostle justly can glory, but only in his communion with Christ Jesus whose servant he is, and in his relation to God whose Gospel he preaches (17). For he would never dare to speak of anything as his work that Christ had not actually done through him for the sake of making heathen obedient to the Gospel whether it be by word or deed (18), the latter in the power granted by God to perform even signs and miracles, the former in the power of the Holy Spirit speaking through him (comp. Matt. 10, 20), thus enabling him fully to preach the joyous tidings of Christ our Savior, beginning at Jerusalem, the Old Testament city of God, and gradually widening the circle of his activity until he reached the western shores of Greece (19). But in doing this he always made it a point of honor to preach the Gospel at such places only

V. 16. *Εἰς τὸ εἶναι*: so that I should be: the purpose of the grace given him. *Ἱερουργούντα* *κτλ.* explains more fully *λειτουργόν* *Χ. Ἰ*: administering as a priest the Gospel. "The offering of the gentiles": the gentiles themselves are the offering (explanatory genitive). "Sanctified in the Holy Ghost": made holy, dedicated to God and His service in the communion of the Holy Ghost (*πνεύμ. ἁγ.* without the article because a proper noun).

V. 17. *Θύν*: in consequence of this calling. *Ἐχω*: emphatic: I have it, am not without, need not arrogate it. *Καύχῃσιν*: (act of) glorying; not cause of glorying (*καύχημα*). comp. 1 Cor. 15, 31. *Τὰ πρὸς τ. θ.*: with respect to that which refers to God; in my relation to God (comp. Hebr. 2, 17; 5, 1).

V. 18. *Γάρ* proves that Paul does not arrogate to himself any improper glorying, as intimated in verse 17; *ὧν=τούτων ᾧ*; *κατεργάσατο* is emphatic: actual accomplishments are opposed to mere talking and planning. "Unto the obedience of heathen": comp. 1, 5 (*ὕπακοήν* without the article because, besides being an abstract noun, governed by a preposition and followed by a genitive). *Λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ* belongs to *κατεργάσατο* (comp. Luke 24, 19; Acts 7, 22; 2 Cor. 10, 11).

V. 19. "In the power of signs and wonders" refers to "deed"; "in the power of the Holy Spirit" to "word" (chiastic position). Still the latter clause could be regarded as modifying the former, stating the power that made possible the working of signs and wonders; but the repetition of *ἐν δυνάμει* favors the former interpretation, which is also the usual one (comp. 1 Cor. 2, 4, 5). *Σημεῖα* and *τέρατα* denote the same thing: the latter pointing to the extraordinary feature causing astonishment and wondering, the former to the higher significance as a symbol and proof of something heavenly and divine. *Τέρατα* never stands without

where the Redeemer of the world was still unknown, since it was not the office of an apostle to continue the mission work begun by another, but rather to lay the first foundation himself (20; comp. 1 Cor. 3, 10); for they were to fulfill the prophecy of old, that the glorious message of the Gospel should be brought to them that had not yet heard of it, in order that also they might come to believe and understand it (21; comp. Isa. 52, 15).

*B. The Apostle expresses his Hope to Come to them: Vv. 22-33.*

The fact that the Apostle had been occupied with the duties of his office in the territory mentioned above (19), had also been mostly the cause that prevented him from paying the Christians at Rome a visit (22). But now having planted the Church in the principal places of that region, so that the work could be continued by others (comp. 20), and having had for many years the desire to come to them

σημεῖα, but the latter occurs by itself including the former. Sometimes δυνάμεις is added denoting the divine power necessary for the performance of miracles (comp. Acts 2, 22; 2 Cor. 12, 12;—Acts 8, 13). "So that I could fulfil, complete, fully preach, the Gospel" (comp. Col. 1, 25): ὥστε with the infinitive denoting the possibility, or also necessity, of an act or event that may, or may not, have taken place. "From Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum" has the emphasis pointing out the great extent of activity.

V. 20. Shows in what spirit Paul performed the duties of his office; δέ leads over to this. "But in this way loving honor"—making this a point of honor, "to preach the Gospel not wherever Christ had been named": the unusual place of the negation makes the statement stronger.

V. 21. A literal citation after the Septuagint. "To whom no announcement was made concerning Him (they) will see", namely, what has occurred, the salvation that has been achieved by Him; "and who have not heard" concerning it, they "will understand."

V. 22. "Wherefore also": καί connects the hindrance with the activity, the latter being the cause of the former (διό). "I was being hindered": ἐνεχοπτόμην, imperfect, denoting duration. Τὰ πολλά: in the majority of cases—mostly, as a rule; there were also other hindrances. Τοῦ ἐλθεῖν: genitive of separation dependent on the verb of hindering.



(23), he expected to see this desire fulfilled as soon as he could undertake the contemplated journey to Spain; for he hopes on his way thither to see them and to be escorted to his new field of labor by a delegation from their midst (comp. Acts 15, 3; 1 Cor. 16, 6; 2 Cor. 1, 16), after he had first been recreated by their communion at least to some extent, since the duties of his office did not permit him to stay long at a place where the Gospel was already preached (24). But for the present he is on his way to Jerusalem, in the service of the Christians there (25). For the Christian congregations in Macedonia and Greece had been pleased to make up some collection and thus to show their sympathy and brotherly communion to those Christians at Jerusalem that were in want (26). This had been

V. 23. *Μηκέτι*: no longer, contrary to the expectation that some might harbor (the *subjective* negation warding off the idea). *Τόπον*: room, opportunity, occasion (comp. 12, 19): his work as an apostle had been done there, and hence that was no more the place for him. *Τοῦ ἐλθεῖν* is dependent on *ἐπιποθείαν* (longing, desire; comp. 1, 11; 2 Cor. 7, 7). "From many years."

V. 24. *Ὡς ἄν*: as soon as (comp. 1 Cor. 11, 34; Phil. 2, 23). After *Σπανίαν* Paul in his lively manner inserts an explanatory clause which by its length prevents him from completing the main sentence, especially since the former in a manner already contained the idea wanting in the latter (comp. 2, 17 sqq.; 5, 12, sqq.; 1 Tim. 1, 3 sq.—2 Pet. 2, 4 sqq.). Others construe the clause "as soon as I shall go to Spain" with the preceding one and regard *οὐνί δέ* in verse 25 as resuming the *οὐνί δέ* in verse 23 (comp. the Revised Version). That would make Paul's wish to visit the Romans dependent, from the very beginning, on his journey to Spain, which does not agree with other statements concerning this visit (comp. 1, 11-13; Acts 19, 21). "Passing through", namely, on my journey, not staying long. *θεάσασθαι*: to behold, look upon, with admiration and joy. *Ἐξεῖ* instead of *ἐξεῖσε*, as the English *there* for *thither* (comp. Matt. 2, 22; John 11, 8). "First": before going further on the journey. "In part": not as much as he would desire, but as much as was possible under the circumstances. *Ὑμῶν . . . ἐμπλησθῶ*: with *you* (emphatic) your communion, I desire to be filled, satisfied, refreshed, comforted (comp. 1, 12).

V. 25. "Serving": already now, collecting and carrying the collection. "The saints": comp. 12, 13. So he had no selfish motives for postponing the journey to Spain and the visit to Rome.

V. 26. *Ἀχαΐα*: in the New Testament the usual name for Greece, including as a Roman province all of ancient Greece

their pleasure, and the example they hereby set was commendable; and correctly viewed, they had only done their duty, since they, as heathens by descent, had been made partakers of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, faith, love, and hope, that were in the first place promised and given to the Christians out of Israel, and thus were bound to show their gratitude by ministering to their wants in matters pertaining to the frail body (27). This duty in the matter, namely, to make the Christians at Jerusalem sure of the support granted them by delivering the result of the collection safely into their hands, the Apostle of course had first to attend to; but after that he expected to enter upon his journey to Spain, and to go by way of Rome, so as to see his fellow-Christians there (28). And he was confident of coming to them not empty-handed, but rather with the fulness of the blessings procured by Christ and laid down in the Gospel (29 comp. 1, 11).

And now he prays them earnestly, appealing to their common Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and to the mutual love wrought by the Holy Spirit, to come to his aid in the dangers that he sees in his path, by interceding for him with

except Thessaly and Epirus. *Κοινωνία*: participation, communion, fellowship; in the New Testament and in ecclesiastical writers also the manifestation and proof of it, hence here contribution, collection. *Τινά*: some; it was not prescribed how great it was to be. "For the poor of the saints at Jerusalem": they were not all so poor that they needed support (*πτωχός* poor=reduced to beggary, whilst *πένης* implies simply the necessity of working for one's living, living from hand to mouth).

V. 27. "For they were pleased", thought it good: a repetition for the sake of emphasis and commendation, and also of adding something. "The heathen": to that class the Christians in Macedonia and Achaia belonged. *ῥοφείλουσιν* is an apt reference to *ὀφείλονται*: as debtors they are in debt, owe it. *Λειτουργῆσαι*: it was a service rendered the public, i. e., the Christian community (comp. 13, 6; 2 Cor. 9, 12; 1 Cor. 12, 26). Comp. 1 Cor. 9, 11.

V. 28. *θῶν*: that had to be done first. "This fruit," of collecting, is "sealed" unto the Christians at Jerusalem by delivering it to them; then it is secured, confirmed, and ratified as now their possession (comp. John 3, 33). *Ἀπελεύσομαι*: I shall go away, depart, begin a journey. *Δι' ὑμῶν*: through you, passing through your city and seeing you.

V. 29. "In the fulness": in possession of it, provided, supplied with it (comp. 1 Cor. 4, 21). *Ἐρχόμενος . . . ἐλεύσομαι*:

God (30), that on the one hand he may be delivered from the hatred and violence of the unbelieving Jews in Palestine, who regarded him as the mortal enemy of their people and religion; and that on the other hand the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, who could be expected to be prejudiced against the apostle of the gentiles and the unflinching champion of freedom from the Law, may be pleased with the service that he is doing them in bringing that collection (31); so that his coming to the brethren at Rome may be a joyful one, and he, if this be in accordance with the good and gracious will of God, may be recreated together with them in their mental communion (32). And in view of all the strife and affliction that he sees looming up in the distance like a dark cloud, he prays that the God who is the author of true peace and happiness which the world can neither give nor take (John 14, 27), may be and abide by them all (33).

in coming I shall come, my coming will be such a one (comp. 1 Cor. 2, 1;—Phil. 2, 2).

V. 30. "Brethren": comp. 10, 10. "Through our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.": Jesus Christ and the love wrought by the Spirit are the means, the motives, that Paul uses to induce them to do what he asks (*διὰ* c. *gen.*, not *acc.*, comp. 12, 1). "Love of the Spirit": genitive of cause or authorship (comp. Gal. 5, 22). *Συναγωνίσασθαι*: to strive, contend, fight, struggle together (*μοι*: with me)=to aid and support me in my struggles. Fervent prayer is a struggle of the heart against dangers and troubles that threaten.

V. 31. *Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων*: "away from the disobedient"—from those that refuse the obedience of faith (comp. 11, 30 sq.; John 3, 36; Acts 6, 7). *Διακονία*=*δωροφορία* (a variant reading): the service here consisted in the bringing of a gift; *εἰς*, *Ἱεροσόλυμα*: intended for Jerusalem. "Saints": comp. verse 25 sq.

V. 32. *Ἰνα*: the purpose of verse 31, hence subordinate to the *ἵνα* there (comp. Gal. 4, 5). "In joy": he came to Rome as a prisoner, contrary to his expectations, still happy to see the brethren there and preach the Gospel also at the capital of the world. *Συναναπαύσασθαι ὁμῖν*: may find rest, or refreshment, together with you (comp. 1, 12).

V. 33. Compare, as to the addition of a wish befitting the preceding exposition, verses 5 and 13; as to the expression "God of peace", 1 Cor. 14, 33; 2 Cor. 13, 11; Phil. 4, 9; 1 Thess. 5, 23. The verbal form *εἴη* or *ἔστω* is to be supplied.

## THE CENTRAL THEOLOGICAL PROBLEM OF THE DAY.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

In the vast and variegated theological problems and perplexities of the times, there is yet one central point of unity around which they all circle and in relation to which they all find their importance. This central thought and issue is the doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures. The cardinal problem of the theological world, international in its extent, is the question: What think ye of the Bible? Whence is this book? of God or of man? History is repeating itself. The formal principle of the Reformation, namely that the Word of God, and this alone, on account of its divine inspiration, is the only and absolutely safe last court of appeals in all matters of faith and life, the possession of which rule has been regarded as one of the fixed facts of Evangelical Protestantism, has again been seriously called into question, and that not by the old enemies of the divine truth, the Roman Catholic Church, but by the Protestants themselves. No matter in what department of theological research the debatable questions may be found, be it in that ordinarily known as Higher Criticism, or in that of Systematic Theology, as is done by the aggressive Ritschlian school, or in the Ethical, it matters not, the radical and revolutionary character of the current advanced theological science is chiefly attributable to the changed attitude toward the Scriptures, their character, their origin, their history, their authority. Behind, over, and above all the issues that are agitating the Church it is this problem of the Word of God in its rights and authority over the creeds and deeds of the Christians that is the cynosure of all eyes in the theological world.

That this has become so is chiefly to be ascribed to historical causes. The central problem of theology is changeable according to the needs and interests of the generation. As a rule it is determined by practical requirements. It is extremely rare that purely abstract, scholastic or scientific interests exercise a determining influence on deciding what the chief concern or question of the theology of the day shall be. It was natural and necessary that in the primitive Church, apologetics should have been in the forefront and been the first theological discipline that flourished in the literature of the Church. Even the New Testament Scrip-

tures themselves, far from being a collection of abstract treatises on the teachings of Christian faith and life, were largely controlled by such interests in their contents and character and their thoroughly apologetical nature would no doubt be all the plainer and clearer if we knew more about their history, their authors, time, occasions, and persons to whom they were addressed. That later on, in the third and following centuries the Trinitarian and Christological problems became the burning questions of the day is readily understood on historical grounds. In this case, too, as is generally the case the issue was forced upon the Church by attacks upon what the Christians instinctively recognized as cardinal and essential elements of their faith. Here again it was not left to the Church to determine what the centre of its theological thought should be, and in this case as is generally the case, the attitude of the Church in the matter was more negative and defensive over against the attempts to subvert her foundations. The Reformation again is an instructive example of this lesson of Church history. It is remarkable and yet easily understood that Luther, although such a voluminous writer and the prince of theological teachers, did not furnish a summary of his doctrines in the shape of a treatise on systematic theology. Luther wrote no dogmatics, and yet he was the greatest dogmatician since the days of St. Paul, and the doctrines of the Church were the great debatable ground between him and his adversaries. Historical causes made him a practical reformer and not an abstract theological writer, and his deep and detailed discussion of the essential doctrines of Christianity appears in the shape of sermons (of which the Erlanger edition contains twenty and more whole volumes), catechetical, polemical and similar kinds of theological discussions. Both in matter and manner Luther's writings were largely the result of causes over which he personally had no control.

The same is true of our day and date. The Scriptures have become and they are in modern theology chiefly through the historical development of theology in general in connection with the leading scientific interests of the age. The prominence now assigned the Bible is in marked contrast to the condition of affairs in former generations. The *locus de Scriptura Sacra* was one that only at a comparatively late period found its way into the dogmatics of the Lutheran Church, and even now yet, traditionally, is assigned to the Introduction and not to the body of such works. The Symbolical books of the Lutheran Church nowhere have a specific pronouncement on the Scriptures or their inspira-

tion or authority. To conclude from this, as an *argumentum ex silentio*, as was done some years ago even by so prominent a Lutheran as Professor Frank, of Erlangen, that this absence indicated that our confessions thereby indicated that they did not want to teach the absolute inerrant character and complete verbal inspiration of the Bible, is evidently a *deus ex machina* invented for the purpose of finding an excuse for a departure from what is manifestly the attitude of the Symbols on the Scriptures, namely that these are the infallible Word of God, and as the revealed truth from God have the absolute deciding voice in all matters pertaining to the teachings and beliefs of the Church. The absence of an *ex-professo* declaration of the Lutheran confessions on this matter emphasizes only all the more the real attitude of the Church, which was so fixed and firm that it required no formal declaration. It would have been just as natural to expect from these confessions a formal declaration of belief in the existence of a God.

There can be no doubt that the revision of and change of the position of Protestantism over against the Scriptures is largely the outcome of a general tendency and trend of the scientific thought of the age. There never was a time when there was such a cosmopolitanism in the world of learning and of scholarship as is the case at present. The various sciences and departments of research are not developed independently of each other, but in them all a fixed tendency and spirit characteristic of the whole age makes itself a fact and force that is felt in a most positive manner. It requires but a superficial knowledge of the learned world of the day to recognize the fact that the Natural Sciences and the spirit dominating these sciences are the controlling power also in nearly all other lines of scholarship. And in the Natural Sciences we are living in the age of Darwin and of Natural Selection. No principle is more potent in modern scholarship, for both good and bad results, than the idea of development. And in all the sciences of the day, as represented by advanced thought, this idea has had revolutionary results. Outside of the Natural Sciences themselves, its influence can be most easily recognized in the study of history. Even the secular history of all the leading peoples of the earth has been seriously modified by the adoption of this principle as the chain that unites into one whole the many details and data that compose the record of such peoples. The Wellhausen-Kuenen school has demonstrated what this principle has done with the history of the religion of which the Biblical books are the official records. The

popular reconstruction scheme of the Higher Critics really aims at nothing but at a purely naturalistic history of Israel and of its religion, seeking to demonstrate that the factors that were operative in the development of this history were purely of a natural kind, excluding God as a special factor, as also all demonstrations or exhibitions of divine interference in the order of natural laws, such as wonders, miracles, etc. This is practically what the late Professor Delitzsch did call this scheme, namely "a religion of the era of Darwin."

The control of the scientific and scholastic research of the times by the principles obtaining in the department of the Natural Sciences is a different kind of a subjection from that exercised in the Middle Ages and at least partially during the times of the Reformation and of Protestant Orthodoxy by theology itself. The latter was more external and mechanical, the former internal and philosophical. In reality, e. g. there was no connection between the Natural Sciences and theology in the Middle Ages. Yet the results of the former were entirely under the control of the latter, and were forced to conform. The condition of affairs was not unlike that which prevails in the Roman Catholic Church of to-day: where every botanist, geologist, or scientist knows beforehand what his results will be, namely that they will be in conformity, not necessarily with the Scriptures, but with the theological teaching of his Church. Such a control is purely mechanical of one science over another. In modern world of research, inclusive of theology, it is the spirit of the Natural Sciences, the dogmatics behind the researches, falsely claimed to be "without any prejudgments" (*vorurteilslos*)—an impossible condition of affairs—that exercises dominion over the advanced theological thought of the times.

And this is really the prime cause that has led to the revolutionary views now current in critical circles concerning the Scriptures. That these have thus become the central theological problem of the age is then not accidental, but in fact necessary. Consciously or unconsciously the problem stared the student in the face: How can the conception of the Scriptures be harmonized with the general trend of philosophical and scientific thought of the age? It was readily recognized at all hands that the traditional ideas concerning the Bible, which found in this book a collection of divinely inspired, inerrant, and hence normative and absolutely decisive writing, an entirely unique codex, internally and essentially differing from all other productions of the

pen — this idea was of course in conflict with the current sources of modern scholarship. Fortunately or unfortunately the Scriptures themselves, by their very nature, furnished those seeking to harmonize what really was never intended to be harmonized, the means for a solution satisfactory to themselves. The books of the Bible did not come down from heaven as accomplished facts, as Mohammed claims that the Koran did. The contents of the Scriptures are the expression of an historical development of God's dealings with His people and were reported to us by His Prophets, and Evangelists, and Apostles, whose individuality the books they wrote clearly bear. The books of the Bible are accordingly not only divine, but also human productions. Where is the line of demarcation between these two elements? Was the human element, which is such an apparent factor in the Scriptures everywhere, potent enough to make itself felt and do the books of the Scriptures accordingly bear the weaknesses and exhibit the failing and faults common to all human things? Or was the divine element so powerful that notwithstanding this pronounced human side in the Scriptures it guarantees to the readers absolute truth and certainty?

To these questions the old theology had with all determination answered that such a guarantee is furnished and that the Scriptures are indeed a divine-human book, but that first and foremost they are divine. Modern theology has given a different answer; and in conformity with the general naturalistic principles of the age has attempted to reduce to a minimum or practically to nothing, making the Scriptures essentially a purely human product. It requires no wide or deep knowledge of the modern critical works to see that their tendency one and all is to exclude from the Scriptures as much as possible everything that points to a direct divine interference or activity, and the aim is to make the historical development recorded in the Scriptures, as also the religion there taught, as much as possible entirely the product of natural causes. As Kuenen himself says: "Israel's religion is indeed one of the greatest religions of the world, nothing less, *but also nothing more.*" So that the problem concerning the Scriptures has virtually become this question: Are these books a divine revelation of absolute truth, an entirely unique collection of writings, with the authority of God behind and within them; or, are they more or less a mixture of divine truth and human error and practically a codex of the same kind as are other "sacred books," such as the Koran, the Vedas, or the Anesta? It is



this question that is behind all the other problems in the theological thought of the day. If this question has once been definitely decided, then the other difficulties, such as those raised by the Ritschl school concerning the character and reliability of religious knowledge in general, concerning the relation of doctrine and dogma to ethics and Christian life, would be much more readily solved. But all of the theological problems of the hour, when analyzed down to bottom facts will be seen to stand in the closest connection with the question as to the character and reliability of the Scriptures.

It would, however, not be correct to claim that the protagonists of the newer theology and of advanced thought in general have reached their conclusions from such an abstract philosophical standpoint. On the contrary, the claim is made that these conclusions are the results of an analysis and a synthesis of the facts as furnished by the contents of the Scriptures. In other words, the inductive method is claimed to demand such a new conception of the Word of God. There can be no doubt as to the philosophical correctness of the deductive method. All generalizations and scientific propositions should rest upon such a process. But the application of the method only too often vitiates its teachings. And such a case we have before us. All the conservative Scripture students have the same facts before them that even the most radical men have, yet the former see no necessity for drawing such destructive results, but find the contents and the facts of the Scriptures in perfect harmony with the conviction of the divine character and the inspiration of the Scriptures. The whole matter is not that of facts, but solely of the interpretation of facts. Delitzsch knew all the facts concerning the Scriptures probably better than Wellhausen and Kuenen did; yet Delitzsch believed that these facts taught that the Scriptures were the inspired Word of God, while the leaders of the radical school saw in them little or nothing of divine truth. It all depends upon the manner in which these facts are made to tell their story. If the arrangement, understanding, classification, and still more the interpretation of these facts, are controlled by the central *a priori* idea that they are expressions of more or less naturalistic process, that Israel's history is only the unfolding of that people's rare gifts and natural endowments for religious thought, so that this philosophy of history is the one controlling factor in the construction of the scheme of which these facts are the individual elements — in this case quite naturally nothing but a naturalistic scheme can result,

and does result. But in this case the whole result is really "a begging of the question." It was certain from the outset and has no claim to scientific accuracy or correctness. Of all the theologies of the times, just the neological criticism has the least right to claim what it insists that it alone represents, namely purely scientific methods and results. It is controlled by a more pronounced dogmatism, that of the development philosophy of a Darwin, the "gradlienige" process with which the late Professor Dillmann, of Berlin, himself a sharp critic, was accustomed to charge the newer school.

But this whole discussion emphasizes anew the old truth that trust in the Scriptures is a matter of faith, worked through the Spirit, and not a matter of historical or archæological deduction. The old teaching concerning the "*testimonium Spiritus Sancti*" is still solid and substantial principle. We can be and ought to be thankful for all that the archæological discoveries in the Nile and the Euphrates-Tigris valleys are doing in confirmation of the Scriptures; but at best they can never do more than produce a *fides humana* in the Word of God, and never a *fides divina*. No man has ever been or will ever be convinced of the truth of the Scriptures as the revealed Word of God that can show him the way to light and life, by logic or archæology, or history. This the Spirit of God alone can do.

In the meanwhile, although it is the duty of the believers in the Word to defend it with all their might and main, there need be no worry as to the ultimate outcome. This is not the first time that the divine character of the Bible has been assailed. The old fight between faith and unfaith has only assumed a new form. The struggle itself is as of old, and the outcome will be as of old. The Scriptures have always gained by such attacks, and it is gaining by the present onslaught. But the Scriptures will stand forever, *Verbum Dei manet in æternum!*

## ELOCUTION FOR PREACHERS OR PUBLIC SPEAKING.

BY REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

### DEFECTS IN THE VOICE.

There are two kinds of defects in the utterance of speech. The one may be called organic and is of a nature easily seen and felt. The possessor is greatly to be pitied because of the defect and because of the embarrassment resulting from it. Stuttering, stammering, hesitation and like hindrances are known and deplored by all, and by none more than by the possessors. These conditions are not hopeless. No one thus afflicted should consider himself beyond help or thereby debarred from the office of the holy ministry. There are many examples of great success in preaching where one of these troubles seemed to interpose an insurmountable barrier. "Where there is a will there is a way" has eminent application here. Great will power and special direction are needed. Phillips Brooks is an example of what great resolution can do, when rightly directed, to overcome such obstacles to *good speech*. Persons of great gifts and determination may overcome them; but the best thing for such persons is to apply to teachers who devote much time and attention to the help of those so afflicted. We do not have these defects in view. They are felt by all.

§ 14. Our object is to speak of those defects to good utterance which are mostly not known by the speaker, but which interfere with effective speech and greatly hinder the carrying power of the voice. The first we will name, and the most important, is

ASPIRATION. It is air passing through the larynx without being turned into tone, when one is in the act of speech. It is the most dangerous, because it rasps the vocal chords, often causes the preacher's sore throat, renders the speech inaudible to a large company of people, wearies the speaker because too much effort is required, and causes the hearer to miss the word. Most speakers, who have not had special training, have this trouble in abundance, especially when they try to be emphatic in a gentle tone, and in sympathetic and persuasive passages. The first thing is to find out what it is, and then to apply the remedy. The modern trend in elocution is never to mention defects, lest it discourages and leads to an unconscious adoption of them. Life is too short

and the expense too great for all speakers to pursue such methods. No one can ever be a teacher who cannot tell the defects in a voice, much less can one correct himself when he sees and feels no defect, even if he recognizes that another's voice is superior to his own. The detection and correction of aspiration will help the speaker in many ways. Let him set himself about it in earnest, and not flatter himself that he has it not, or if he has, it is not worth the effort for its correction. Let one learn these three words, and their application to this point.

Whisper = all air — no tone.

Aspiration = mixture of air and tone.

Vocality = all tone — pure tone.

§ 15. Practice this exercise daily until you know what aspiration is and have a desire to be rid of it:

1. Count 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, in a whisper and in one breath.

2. Count the same in one breath and one-fifth tone and four-fifths whisper.

3. Count the same in one breath and half tone and half whisper.

4. Count the same in one breath, and have the effort one-fifth whisper and four-fifths tone.

5. Count the same in one breath and make it all tone, the best you can produce.

Put will power into the practice and have a desire to learn and you will not only find out what aspiration is, but you will strengthen the vocal cords, correct the huskiness of the voice, and make long strides toward the acquirement of a pure tone. Every one who is afflicted with the preacher's sore throat should make diligent use of this exercise, and in connection with the exercises in raising the soft palate and lowering the base of the tongue he will find a remedy for his trouble. — In addition he should gargle twice a day, allowing the water to go very low in the throat, and once or twice per week put a little salt in it. After severe use of the throat and after perspiration wash the outside of the throat with cold water and dry it thoroughly with a good crash towel.

§ 16. NASALITY. This defect is most to be deplored in a minister. Its meaning is scorn, and is frequently combined with the guttural in which hatred has its real home. These qualities have no proper place in the declaration of the gospel of peace. It is better to present even the things to be shunned with tears in the eyes than with the denuncia-

tions of scorn and hatred, especially if they are shown in the voice. "A person with a severe cold does not talk through his nose, but in reality without its use, as the nasal passages being closed, he substitutes the corresponding consonants, b for m, d for n, and g for ng." Good, clear tones *include* the nasal element, but the catarrhal tones *exclude* them. Nasal tones are generally caused by the soft palate hanging down, and thereby causing the air column to carry the tone into the nostrils or to carry tones and words into the nostrils that do not contain nasal elements.

A way to find whether or not nasality exists. Take any sentence in which m, n, or ng does not occur. "I will test this myself" will do. Clasp the nostrils with thumb and finger, completely closing them; if you can speak the words with perfect clearness you may be sure there is no nasality. If some of the words try to press their way through the nostrils, thereby causing the tones to be impure, you can be sure nasality exists.

#### § 17. Exercises:

1. Take sentences in which the nasal elements m, n, and ng do not occur, hold nostrils with thumb and finger, and talk the sentence at a distant object in such a way as to require the opening of the throat. Increase the force but do not raise the pitch in the repetitions.

2. Pronounce the words "Correct Letters" several times, making them as nasal as possible, at the same time putting thumb and first finger to the nostrils in such a way as to obstruct the air in its outward passage completely, but not clasping them. Holding the thumb and finger in the same way, say them as clearly as possible, making the contrast as vivid and plain as possible. Remove the hand and pronounce them entirely free from defect. There are three steps in this.

These exercises are beneficial even if nasality be not present. They will help to raise the soft palate and thus to correct the trouble at its seat.

Review also the exercises for raising the soft palate and study them in connection with nasal tones.

§ 18. *Orality* is a defect which signifies weakness, and it may be physical, mental or moral. In a high pitch it sounds like a whine. The resonance is confined to the mouth.

The nasal chambers are long and large passages running from the front of the face back nearly to the ear cavities. A resonance in the nasal chamber is probably the richest element in the human voice. It differs entirely from

nasality, which is a resonance in the nose itself. Orality can be best seen when a big man has a little voice bordering on the whine. The finest illustration of it I ever saw was at a lecture in Columbian University, Washington, D. C. Dr. Wharton, lecturer on International Law, and author of a work on International Law, was engaged to give a course in that institution. I was one of the hearers. He sits on the platform with the president who now rises and presents him. He is of medium height, large chest and shoulders and inspires respect and raises expectation. The introduction; excellent and eulogistic, is over and the speaker stands before us. His bows of recognition are good, and his address to president and audience proper. But whose voice is that we hear? It cannot be that of the deep-chested and strong man before us. Something must be wrong. The voice and the physical man do not go together. Were it not for the wisdom which fell from the lips one could scarcely have resisted the impulse to run away from the place. There may have been throat trouble, but orality was so prominent that the word suggests him as the illustration.

Every pastor may find this quality in the sick room and learn to know it, and to observe how near it comes to the whine. The dude in his sickly drawl of a speech nearly always borders on this defect; opens the mouth and not the throat.

§ 19. Exercise: Close the mouth, inhale the fullest possible breath through the nostrils, then project a heavy reverberating tone, like distant thunder, into the head. The pitch must be as low as possible. While the tone is in progress give it a few sudden blows in the nasal chamber. This will secure a good nasal resonance, and then if the voice is kept from the whine, orality cannot appear.

The exercises for enriching the voice, which will appear later, will completely take away all orality from the voice.

§ 20. *Throatiness* — is a defect caused by too small an opening in the throat or too great rigidity of the walls of the throat. The sound may be observed by prolonging the sound e; or by holding words with the sound e. E is the closest sound in our language and most frequently shows forth the throatiness. It is harder to keep an open throat on this sound than on any other. For this reason many singers use some other sound for it. The fault is in the making of the sound. E should be made with the tip of the tongue and then the throat may be as well open as in the sound ah. If in trying to open the throat the muscles

are rigid at first and produce throaty tones, there is no cause for discouragement. Keep on until the throat will lie open as easily as shut and all throatiness from a squeezed throat will disappear. The muscles must hold the throat open, and in time will do it without any strain.

This defect may be caused by holding the head to one side, by shaking or twisting it, and thus disturbing the easy and natural flow of the air into and from the larynx.

---

## PASTORAL VISITATION OF THE SICK.

BY REV. WALTER L. SPIELMAN, A. B., COLUMBUS, O.

(Published by Resolution of Columbus English Conference.)

Some persons seem to be specially fitted for the office of comforting and consoling those who are in distress. The sorrowing and the troubled are attracted to them as steel to a magnet, or as the thirsty to a spring of water. Their door-steps are worn by the passing feet of many weary sufferers. Especially can this be said of some pastors. Not every pastor has this gift. One has the gift of eloquence, another has the gift of clear and forceful logic, one has the gift of good sound judgment, and another has the gift of catechisation. One has special gifts qualifying him for missionary work, and still another has special gifts for pastoral work among the sick. He who has this latter gift, certainly possesses an enviable talent, and one that is by no means common. That pastor, therefore, who has been thus favored by the Giver of every good and perfect gift, should take care not to bury his talent in a napkin, but to preserve it and develop it in the service of the Master, "neglecting not the gift that is in him."

It may be, therefore, that some possess this gift in greater degree than they realize, because it has never been specially developed and used; or it may be, too, that some have a zeal for this particular branch of pastoral work, but that their zeal is not always according to knowledge. It will be the object of this paper, therefore, to seek to arouse a greater interest in this particular branch of pastoral work, which is, alas, so often neglected, and also to lay down a few general rules pointing out the course usually to be pursued in the discharge of this work.

First of all let it be understood that the visitation of the sick is a duty. Even humanity realizes that. As human

beings we are so constituted that sorrow and suffering in others awakens sympathy in us, and almost unconsciously the impulse arises in us to lend a helping hand, and to seek to alleviate the sufferings around us.

But as Christians we feel this duty especially. The love of Christ constraineth us, and if we are true followers of Him who was specially anointed by the Holy Spirit to heal the sick and broken-hearted, we must feel at once the force of St. James' words, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction," etc. A Christian, therefore, obeys this impulse not as a compelling force from without, but as a constraining force within, doing it out of love to Christ, and through Him, to the brethren; and that this is acceptable unto God we can see at once from the Master's own words, "I was sick and ye visited me. . . . Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Especially, however, does the visitation of the sick become a duty unto us as pastors. If it is the duty of Christians to visit the sick, it is the duty of pastors in an especial sense. We, as pastors, are called "to watch over the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers." We are at all times to watch over the souls entrusted to our care, as those who must render an account before the judgment bar of God. Does not this apply particularly, therefore, in times of sickness, when the powers of darkness assail the believer with greater power than usual, and when just because of his sickness he is less able to render a watchful and vigorous resistance? Is not all sickness the dreadful result of the awful fact that sin is in the world, and though the malady shows itself visibly in the body, in the hollow features, the emaciated form, and the feeble and painful movements of the patient, is the dread disease not in reality gnawing rather at the soul, and does not the patient who always needs spiritual support, need it then especially, when by his sickness he is deprived of visiting God's house and feeding there upon heavenly food? To visit the sick is then a part of the pastor's office. Of course, as has well been said, "We cannot perform miracles as Christ did, healing the sick; but we can apply the means of grace." And more than that, we should apply them, for thereunto are we called as stewards over the mysteries of God. That, then, ought to be plain to all, that the visitation of the sick is a duty of the pastor. When that is once plain, then the treatment of the subject resolves itself simply



into the questions how, when, and among whom this duty is to be discharged.

This duty is to be discharged toward members of the flock without distinction of persons. The visitation of the sick opens up a wide field of labor and usefulness, a field rich in offering opportunities and open doors for missionary activity, and a field not necessarily confined within the limits of the congregation. The pastor not only may, but even should try to call also upon the sick and afflicted who are not members of his flock, provided they be not members of some other congregation; nor should he wait for a special invitation to do so, but show a friendly concern by inquiry and by a friendly call. Such a visit, if made with good judgment, cannot be misconstrued, nor can it be offensive; but on the contrary, it will be very likely to give an open door for spiritual good to the patient or to the patient's family.

But within the confines of his own flock, it is the duty of the pastor to visit every one who is sick, without distinction of persons, be the patient rich or poor, old or young, a good church member or an indifferent one. For this reason it is, in our opinion, a dangerous thing to accept perquisites for sick calls, just because it might tend to make some pastors more interested in their wealthier patients, or because it might cause some of the poorer classes to feel themselves slighted for that reason, or to feel that they had less claim upon their pastor's services. Whether this custom is in vogue anywhere in our Synod or not, we are not prepared to say, but we do know that it has been observed in portions of Germany in the past, and also in some Missouri Synod congregations in our own land, at no distant date.

Again, the age of the patient should not influence the pastor. Whether it be an adult or a child who is sick, the pastor should call. Children are not to be ignored, for they are members of Christ's Church by baptism, as well as adults, and therefore are also under the pastor's care. Let the pastor learn, then, from Jesus the Good Shepherd, not to despise the little ones, but to gather them tenderly in the arms of his prayers and to carry them on the wings of his pleadings to the bosom of the Father, there to supplicate for them before the throne of grace.

The standing of the patient as a church member should not influence the pastor in this matter either. Sometimes it is the case that pastors will visit almost every day some good old father or mother in Israel, who is sick or indis-

posed, but will forsake almost entirely some poor brother who is weak in the faith and not strong in his love for Christ and the Church. Plainly, this latter class, the careless, the indifferent, the lukewarm church members need care and prayer and spiritual support even more, if anything, than the others, and therefore ought not to be neglected in sickness; for just then, too, the opportunity presents itself, perhaps as never before, to drive home to the hearts of such individuals certain truths greatly needed, and perhaps to awaken them to true and healthful spiritual life.

This duty of pastoral visitation of the sick is to be discharged without delay. A pastor should not wait for an invitation before he calls upon the sick in his congregation. If he waited for that in every case he would not often be called, for experience teaches that even as it is, especially in large congregations, persons will sometimes even have recovered entirely from their sickness before ever the pastor heard that they were sick. A pastor cannot be expected to be omniscient or omnipresent, nor can he, even if his congregation be but of ordinary size, be expected to make the entire rounds every few weeks so as always to know who is sick. Very often parishioners expect entirely too much of their pastor in this regard. They would not expect their family physician to call upon them unless they send for him. Why, then, should they expect so much more of their pastor? A pastor should therefore instruct his people to notify him of sickness in the congregation that he may always be informed, either verbally or by mail; and as soon as possible, after receiving such information, he should call, waiting not, as said before, for a special invitation, and making no unnecessary delay.

The frequency and length of such visits must be determined by circumstances.

No fixed rules can be set as to how often a pastor should repeat his visits upon the sick, or as to how much time should be spent in the sick room. Circumstances must in every case decide that, so that in this matter as in so many others, it is needful especially for a pastor to exercise good judgment, or as men usually say, "good common sense." As a rule the age, temperament, and strength of the patient will help to determine these questions. If the patient be old and feeble, or if he be much exhausted or nervous, or if the sickness be very serious, it is much better to shorten the visits and if necessary to make them more frequently. In such cases where the sick-

ness is dangerous and the time of the visit must necessarily be short, the most important things should be attended to first, without many preliminaries. Often, too, the frequency and length of a pastor's sick visits will be determined somewhat by stress of other duties, although of course, a pastor's good judgment must in such cases also decide which duties are the more important.

The "modus operandi" or the method of procedure in the sick room must also to a great extent be determined by circumstances.

Here, too, no fixed laws can be laid down. A wise pastor will proceed cautiously and discreetly, using good judgment. A few general remarks may, however, serve to point out the proper course usually to be pursued.

First of all, let it be remembered that in sick visits a pastor has duties of a two-fold nature, first toward the patient himself, and then toward the members of the patient's family.

His first duties, then, will be toward the patient. Upon entering the home, the pastor approaches the sick-bed with a friendly greeting to the patient, expresses his sympathy by word and manner, and also seeks to cheer the patient and uplift his spirits. A pastor, therefore, should not cast a shadow of gloom upon the sick-room by his presence, as a Job's comforter, or as if the death-angel were following immediately in his wake, but should rather bring with him the sunshine of true friendship and Christian love. By thus in the very outset winning the good will of the patient, he will prepare the way all the better to the heart of the individual for the spiritual truths which he wishes to impress.

Having done this, he proceeds gently and discreetly to open up the subject of greatest concern, the spiritual condition of the patient. Not too abruptly, nor in an inquisitorial way, but gradually and shrewdly, he draws out the facts in the case, by his conversation, discovering whether the patient be a true believer and stand in grace, and thus noting where enlightenment is needed, or exhortation, or reproof, or comfort. Knowing well the nature and character of the patient, it may not be necessary for him thus to diagnose the case, so that he may proceed at once to minister to his patient's spiritual wants.

In any case care must be exercised, as always, but here especially, in applying the Word of God. In some cases the Gospel may be applied at once with its sweet comforts and

consolations; but in other cases, to pursue this course might be wrong entirely, because the lancet of the law may first be needed to open and probe the festering sore of sin, letting out the corruption before the balm of the Gospel is applied. True, this is not pleasant work to reprove a person for sin, especially a person who is sick; but it must be done at times, for thereunto also are we called, because it is for the patient's own everlasting good; and just in such cases, where the person needing reproof is sick, opportunities are sometimes presented as never before, in all gentleness to speak plainly and pointedly, and to impress with lasting effect upon the heart, some lessons greatly needed and now humbly received. Thus, according to the patient's spiritual needs which are manifested by his confession and actions, the pastor proceeds to apply the remedies, "rightly dividing the Word of Truth."

Further the pastor should see that the nature and purpose of sickness and suffering be properly understood, that the sick person may patiently and willingly submit to the suffering, and also receive the benedictions which the dark-robed messengers of sickness and suffering bring. The patient should therefore be taught to realize that all sickness comes as the result of sin, rightly understood, of course, and that our sicknesses are proofs that we are all sinners, himself included. He should be taught that our bodily ailments and infirmities, in the loving providence of God, are only meant to draw our souls nearer the Great Heavenly Physician, Christ, by teaching us our frailty, our sinfulness, our helplessness and need, and that He alone can help in every trouble, our only and all-sufficient Savior.

He should be taught that our sicknesses are often sent to wean our hearts away from the things of this world, and to make us give more earnest heed to the one thing needful; that often we forget our high calling, and in the rush for temporal goods and pleasures, forget that we are but pilgrims here; and that therefore when we neglect or refuse to take time to think of our soul's welfare, God often lays us on our backs in sickness that we may find the time, and that therefore sickness often comes just to break our proud earthly hopes and cherished plans, and to bring us down to the Everlasting Arms.

He should be taught that sickness in the providence of God is always sent in love and for our good, to strengthen and purify our faith as gold is tried by fire, and that the refining process will only be finished when Christ, who sit-

teth as a refiner over our hearts, can see His image reflected in us; that therefore we have need of patience that the Master's blessed purpose may be accomplished in us. He may be shown, too, that by patience and resignation in suffering, he can bear a noble testimony for Christ before others, especially his family.

He should be shown also that none of us knows whether his sickness shall be unto death or not, but that all sickness comes as the harbinger of death which sooner or later will surely come, and that therefore he is to be prepared for it, in a living faith in Christ.

Of course, where the sickness is dangerous, and the pastor is assured that the patient has not long to live, the most necessary things should be attended to first.

Whether the Lord's Supper should be administered to the patient or not, the pastor must decide according to the circumstances. Not in every case should private communion be administered, not even always when patients desire it, but only when the sickness is dangerous, or having been of long duration, the patient was thereby deprived for some time of the privilege of attending the celebration of the Lord's Supper at the church; and then only, of course, should it be administered when the patient is a communicant member of the Church and is worthily prepared.

In the pastor's intercourse with the patient, God's Word must of course take precedence. Some appropriate passage of Scripture should always be read, the length of it to be determined by the physical condition of the patient. As such passages might be mentioned: Job 33, Isa. 38, portions of Lam. 3, most of the Psalms, the 19th, 23rd, 37th and 103rd being especially appropriate. Then in the New Testament, Luke 15, John 5, John 14, John 15, Acts 3, 1-11, Rom. 5, Rom. 8, Col. 1, 9-29, Hebr. 4, Hebr. 12, James 1, 1 Pet. 1, Rev. 2, Rev. 3, etc. After the reading of Scripture a free prayer may be offered, followed by the Lord's Prayer. Further, if time and the strength of the patient permit, a spiritual talk may be engaged in, the pastor seeking to engage the patient also in the conversation. The pastor may also engage in a short homily upon any one of the various subjects indicated above under the use of affliction. Devotional reading from good books will also be found helpful and edifying. As such might be mentioned especially, Arndt's True Christianity, A'Kempis' Imitation of Christ, Starck's Handbook, and last but not least, Ger-

hard's Sacred Meditations. Furthermore it will be found helpful for the pastor to have at his ready command a store of appropriate Scripture passages and verses of suitable hymns, so that when called upon suddenly, he may be prepared.

After having thus spent the time as profitably as possible during his visit, the pastor takes his leave, exhorting the patient to faith and patience, to pious meditation and prayer, bidding the patient a friendly adieu, with a hearty wish for his speedy recovery, and with the promise of an early return to visit him again.

In conclusion, it should be remembered, as said before, that the pastor also has duties to the members of the patient's family. These duties are too often forgotten or neglected. Let the pastor not neglect to speak a word of sympathy or of exhortation or of comfort, as the case may require, to father or mother, sister or brother or child. Here also the pastor has a wide field opened to him for good, and if he properly uses the opportunities thus offered, he may often, by speaking a fit word in season, succeed in drawing others to see their spiritual duties more fully and to perform them more faithfully.

These few remarks, imperfect as they necessarily are because of the author's comparatively short experience in pastoral work, are humbly submitted with the hope that they may be of at least some benefit to others, who, like the author, feel that their education in this particular line has been extremely meagre and has had to be attained often at the cost of some sad experience or serious blunder.

---

## **FUNERAL SERMON.**

**REV. L. H. SCHUH, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.**

**TEXT: 1 THESS. 4, 13-18.**

Christian Brethren and especially Mourning Friends:

The Creator has given us affections and so it is natural to love each other. We are happy in the exercise of our affections. To be surrounded by congenial spirits, by wife and children, to love them and to see them love each other is one of the purest forms of human enjoyment.

But who will describe our heart-aches when these

bands of affection are violently sundered by death? Tears flow unbidden. They are our only natural relief. Whether men be believers or unbelievers they feel this pain; yet there is a vast difference in their mourning. St. Paul is not a stoic who, in stolid indifference, gives up his weeping. He does not seek to restrain us from weeping. He knows that we cannot refrain from it without doing violence to our nature. But he asks us not to mourn as those who have no hope. When the worldling stands by the bier he is comfortless and his mourning borders on despair; but when the Christian stands by the coffin and the grave he has hope and even amid the gathering darkness there is a rift in the clouds and a ray of light from a better world cheers him. He mourns with hope.

The source of our comfort is the Bible. It was given that through its comforts we might have hope. In cases of affliction men comfort each other; but human comfort is vain. The only balm for the wounded heart is found in the Word. May God help us to apply it to your bleeding hearts!

#### WHAT COMFORT DO THE SCRIPTURES GIVE US CONCERN- ING OUR DEAD?

They teach :

##### I. *That they sleep in Jesus.* Text, verses 13, 14.

What a beautiful figure by which to represent death! There is something dreadful about this king of terrors and we shrink away from his chilly touch and his icy embrace. The world has invented figures by which to represent this unwelcome guest, but after all there is a tinge of sadness and of incompleteness about the broken wheel, the broken pitcher, the sickle and the sheaf. These do not overcome the terrors of death. How much more pleasing is the figure of sleep. We do not dread it; yea, we rather long for it. When we are wearied by the heat and burden of the day, we look forward longingly to that hour when we can recline on the couch and forget all our cares in sleep.

The death of a believer alone is spoken of under this pleasing figure. Christ has taken away the sting of death and has disarmed it. The bee robbed of its sting cannot hurt, the serpent robbed of its fang cannot bite. While the believer walks in the valley of the shadow of death it cannot harm him. Christ has overcome death for His people and turned it into sleep.

Sleep brings rest and for this reason death is so called. It brings rest from all the cares of life. What a burden sin has brought upon us. Who will recount all the hardships that are included in God's curse upon the first transgression? What a daily battle for bread we must wage! What wrestlings with the ills of life we must endure! What heart-aches, what pains, what terrors we suffer! No language can express them. But death brings rest from them all.

It brings rest from our spiritual warfare. As soldiers of the cross we are engaged in an ardent conflict. The kingdoms of light and of darkness are battling for the mastery. Earth is the battle field. We are enrolled under the captain of our salvation and just because we are on His side we are molested. They who have been serious in this holy cause have experienced the ills of this warfare. But they end when death comes and we pass from strife to victory.

Death brings sweet rest with Christ in heaven. To see Him face to face, to carry the victor's palm, to be clothed in garments washed white in the blood of the Lamb, to walk on the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, to behold the eternal city whose light is God Himself, to join with angelic choirs—this, this is the rest which those enjoy who sleep with Jesus.

The departed was a follower of Christ in life and we believe that he is with Him in death. Therefore we do not mourn as those who have no hope.

The Scriptures tell us concerning our dead:

## II *That they will arise.* Text, verses 14-16.

The world laughs at the idea of a resurrection of the dead. "Death ends all," they say, "or if it does not, we cannot know anything with certainty of the hereafter." They appeal to human reason and ask how the body that has been resolved into its original elements can again be animated. But they forget that He who once fashioned the body from the dust of the earth and breathed into it the breath of life, is yet almighty and that He can again quicken the dust.

The Apostle does not suspend our faith in the air; but places it upon an immovable rock, viz., upon the resurrection of Christ. Just as certainly as Jesus arose, so surely shall our dead come forth. Jesus Christ arose from the



dead and as this text intimates by His own power. Even His enemies admitted that His grave was empty. He Himself tells us: "I am the resurrection and the life." If He is the life essentially and in His divine person there dwells almighty power, then death could not hold Him, neither will it be able to put His promise to shame: "I live and ye shall live also." By virtue of the resurrection of Christ the restoration of our dead becomes a possibility. He became "the first fruits of them that slept." But one is first only in reference to others. If Jesus was the "first fruits" then necessarily others must follow.

Jesus who is enthroned at the right hand of God will descend with the voice of an archangel and the shout of trumpets. It will be the shout of victory and of triumph. The last enemy will hear and will release his grasp upon the dead and they will arise. The sleeping army will gather for its final review before the throne of God.

What comfort there is in this revelation of the Word! We love the forms of our dead. We love their clay. In this body we have learned to know them; in it we have conversed with them; by it we have recognized them. In this body we have loved and embraced them and have had sweet communion and fellowship with them and in this body glorified we are once more to possess them. Let those who choose stand by the grave and see it open its maw to receive their dead and let them, if they can, derive comfort from the thought that the earthly tabernacle will now be dissolved and that they shall no more look upon the faces and forms once so dear to them; but to us the thought is utterly heartless and comfortless and we already anticipate that joyful hour in which all that are in their graves shall come forth and we shall ever possess our dead. This is the only thought that can satisfy our affections and stanch our bleeding wounds.

We believe that the departed will arise from the dead. We mourn, but not as those who have no hope.

The Bible tells us concerning our dead:

III. *That they will be reunited with us eternally.*  
Text, verse 17.

In this world we can look for nothing else but the breaking up of our families. Sin is here, consequently death. It will claim ours as its prey. And if it be not that, our children will mature, they will leave us and especially in this reckless land of ours, they will settle in

distant parts. The family circle is broken and fight against it as we will, we are helpless.

But we are comforted that "so shall we ever be with the Lord." Death and its painful separation will be unknown and the reunion of our families will be eternal.

Should God have planted in our hearts these affections for each other, especially for our own blood and will He mock us by leaving them unsatisfied? Should He who has placed this longing in us for our kin, even after they are removed from time, fail to regard His own work? Nay! "There shall be no more death." This is His promise. He is truthful. There shall be no more separation, but we shall ever be with them.

Rest, Resurrection and Reunion—these are the comforts of the Scriptures concerning our dead. Discard the cold comforts of reason and "comfort one another with these words."

May God heal your wounds. Amen!

## THE CONVERTING GRACE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE TRANSITIVE CONVERSION OF THE SINNER.

REV. PAUL S. L. JOHNSON, A. B. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

(Translated from Hollazius' Examen)

PART III, SECTION I, CHAPTER VI.

(Continued).

Question 12: Does God will to convert all men, even the obdurate?

The most merciful God wills by His antecedent will to convert all men, even the obdurate (a), from whom, indeed by His consequent judiciary will He withdraws regenerating, justifying and sanctifying grace; but does not cut off from them the grace common to all (b) by which as long as they live in this world He invites and efficaciously calls them to repentance (c) so that not a few obdurate people are converted (d). Those moreover who maliciously resist the Holy Spirit even to the end of life and die in impenitence, run into eternal destruction by their

voluntary guilt, not by a divine decree absolutely denying them converting grace.

Remark I. When we assert the universal converting grace of the Holy Spirit, we do not speak of the consequent will of God, by which He decreed to save those that believe unto the end, and to condemn those who are impenitent unto the end; but we speak of the antecedent will of God, by which He offers the means of conversion with sufficiency and efficacy to all men on the one hand by inviting to the kingdom of Grace and repentance sinners who are outside of the Church, on the other hand by recalling those that live in the external communion of the Church, but who have fallen by mortal sins from the state of regeneration.

Remark II. Recalling Grace is that which (the first grace having been repressed by a renewal of sin, the Holy Spirit having been cast aside, faith having been lost, while on the contrary a blinding and hardening Satanic possession having been allowed) recalls to repentance, to the means of grace and to salvation, as to a return to a former condition, a most miserable man who of his own accord has fallen and of his own accord is unable to rise again and who is held down by devilish shackles. Such is the definition of Dannhauer, *Hodos. Phoenom.* IX page 877.

Remark III. Recalling grace is bestowed by the antecedent will of God, for Dannhauer being judge, l. c. the misery of a man who has fallen and is about to be converted, as at first, affects the Merciful Father to benevolence.

Remark IV. Our discussion is about men who are in this life and whom the grace of God seriously intends to convert. Dr. Quistorpius in *Biblical Annotations on Matth.* 25 says: "After this life the door of consolation and of good work will be closed." With him Polycarp Leyser agrees, comp. 117 *Harmony* page 1264. "When is the gate of salvation closed? To the individual in the hour of death, to the race on the last day after the universal judgment. For then there will be no more a place for repentance nor time for procuring salvation; but either the strict justice or paternal consolation of God must be expected, while otherwise this gate of the kingdom of heaven is open to anyone as long as he lives, and in general to all men it stands open to the end of the world."

1st Proof for (a) From the classic passage Ez. 18: 21, 22: "But if the wicked will turn from all his sins, that he has committed, and keep my statutes, and do that which

is lawful and right he shall surely live, and shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed they shall not be mentioned unto him. In his righteousness which he hath done shall he live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God; and not that he should turn from his way and live?" With this passage the divine oath in Ez. 33, 11 agrees: "As I live saith the Lord I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his ways and live. Turn ye! Turn ye! For why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Notice in the first place that the prophet speaks of such sinners as are especially wicked, even of those who from a perverse disposition toward sin do fiercely anything that pleases them, who commit robbery, who shed blood, who defile themselves with idolatry, who defile the wife of their neighbor and oppress the needy and poor, vide 14-16. And none the less God offers this recalling grace with very significant words, by using the binding power of an oath by his life and especially by using so serious and favorable a witness of his benevolent disposition that he not obscurely intimates that the doors of converting grace are not closed until that time when the sinner, obstinate and opposing himself resolutely to the recalling grace of God, dies in his sins, a prey to temporal and eternal death. Notice in the second place: When God speaks: "I do not wish the death of the wicked," Hugo Grotius understands these words comparatively, saying: This does not oppose the fact that in God there is a certain limit to mercy as appears from the case of Paraoth, the Canaanites and others. To him Calovius replies: not comparatively but absolutely must these words be understood. God simply wills that a man be converted and live. He does not only prefer his life to his death. Moreover there is nothing in the Scriptures about a limit to God's mercy. It everywhere mentions God's mercy as the very highest having no end, neither does it put a limit to it; but we are commanded to hear the voice of God who in grace calls us; and this purpose is our gracious conversion. "But exhort one another while it is called to-day lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin." Heb. 3, 13. Pharaoh was moved by God to repentance by words and miracles, even to the very end of his life. For even then when he saw Israel cross the Red sea with dry feet there was yet time to return to a wiser understanding to desist from persecuting Israel and warring with God. Nor were the Canaanites cut off from mercy by any absolute decree, that they might not, after seeing and hearing the miracles,

be able to humiliate themselves and to obtain grace, as is evidenced by the example of Rahab and the Gideonites. Therefore we reason: He who does not will the death of the most wicked sinner, but seriously intends his conversion, will antecedently, that all hardened sinners be converted. But does not will etc. Therefore.

2nd Proof for (a) 2 Peter 3, 9. "God is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance. From this apostolic saying we conclude: God wills seriously and efficaciously to convert those toward whom He shows longsuffering to that end that they might not perish but come to repentance. But God shows such longsuffering etc. to the hardened; therefore He wills to convert them.

3rd Proof for (a). 1 Tim 2, 4. God wills to convert those for whom Christ died. Christ died for all men even for the hardened. Therefore God wills to convert them. The major and minor premise are true from the testimony of Paul. "God would have all men to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth; for there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all."

4th Proof for (a). Acts 18, 30. God commands all men everywhere to repent; because He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness. We conclude that God wills to convert those who are to be judged on the last day. But God will judge all men even the obstinate etc. Therefore He wills to convert them.

Proof for (b). It is the common view of theologians that the consequent or just will of God does not rescind, make void or overthrow the antecedent or merciful will of God. Thoughtfully does Dr. Balth. Meisner in *Anthropol. Decad. II* page 108 write: "The judgment of the consequent will cannot take away the universal call which God antecedently wills." To this Dannhauer in *Hodos. C.* page 1447 adds his assent: "The consequent will which pities a few cannot overthrow the antecedent will which pities all. Nor does Dr. Henry Mueller dissent from them in *Semicentur. 2. Theo.* page 52. "The consequent will of God does not take away or rescind the antecedent will." Again page 53. "The antecedent will does not end, as if cut off by the consequent. The same desire to save, which God before had, remains the condition however, is no longer fulfilled. This is also proved by the Scriptures.

(1) According to the antecedent will God does not will the death of the wicked, while they are yet living; but their conversion and life Ez. 33, 11. The consequent or judiciary will does not rescind or take away this universal will of God, so that it would be right to say that God by His consequent will does not will that the hardened sinner turn and live. Let us hear Dr. Huelsemann with whom Calov agrees in Bibl. Illust. on this passage. "It is not necessary for the interpretation of this passage to take recourse to the distinction between the antecedent and consequent will of God. For God does not delight in the destruction of the impious according to the antecedent will, as the Jews calumniously say. But He assigns the impious to destruction by the necessity which arises from His duty as judge; and though He is unwilling, He is forced to carry out the sentence. Lamen. 3, 33.

(2) If from hardened sinners in this life all converting grace were wholly withdrawn by the consequent will they would be like devils, and receive in this life the execution of the judgment. But hardened sinners are not like devils, nor do they in this life receive the execution of the judgment. Therefore converting grace is not wholly withdrawn from the hardened sinners. The connection between the condition and conclusion in the major premise is thus proved: There is no converting grace promised to devils, who even now receive the beginning of the execution of the judgment. See 2 Peter 2, 4 and Jude 6. The conclusion appears from Heb. 9, 27. "It is appointed for men once to die and after that the judgment." After death the judgment finally reaches all hardened men, by which all converting grace is absolutely cut off. But those who are yet in this life have Moses and the prophets whom they should hear so that by the concurrence of the Holy Spirit they may through their word repent. Luke 16, 31.

(3) 'Whoever by the consequent will is given over unto the power of Satan, for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit might be saved on the day of the Lord Jesus, are not by the consequent will absolutely cut off from grace recalling to repentance. But the hardened sinners etc. The minor premise appears from 1 Cor. 5, 5.

(4) Recalling grace is not cut off from those who by the consequent will are given over to a reprobate mind but who yet are led to repentance by the goodness of God. But hardened people in this life etc. Therefore they are not cut off from converting grace. The minor appears from

Rom. 1, 28 comp. with Rom. 2, 4. For in Rom. 1, 28 despisers of the saving knowledge of God are said to be given over to a reprobate mind. These Paul in Rom. 2, 4 gravely addresses "Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" The same we conclude from Psalm 81, 12-14: "But my people would not hearken unto my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up unto their hearts' lust; and they walked in their own counsel. O that my people had hearkened unto me and Israel had walked in my ways!" Because of the hardness of their hearts God dismissed the people of Israel into a bad condition. Yet sincerely and longingly He desired that they should cease from their malicious and pertinacious resistance, and receive saving grace.

Proof for (c) Isa. 65, 2-3. "I have spread out my hands all the day to a rebellious people, which walketh in a way which is not good after their own thoughts; a people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face, that sacrificeth in gardens and burneth incense upon altars of brick."

He who all the day spreads out His gracious hands to rebellious sinners, who provoke Him to wrath, and serve idols, wills the whole time of their lives to convert hardened sinners. But the most merciful God, etc. Therefore He wills to save them the whole time of their lives.

(2) Lamen. 3, 22 compared with Rom. 2, 4. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not. They are new every morning." Whatever mercy is without limit or is not consumed, but is every morning new, is not ended by any limit in this life, but is without any limit universal. But the beneficent mercy of God calling to repentance is without limit, etc. Therefore, it is not ended by any limit of this life, but is limitlessly universal. That the minor premise might be more fully understood, the words of Dr. Sebas. Schmid in his commentary on Jer. 5, 24, should be noted. Even the daily blessings of God invite men to repentance, since His beneficent forbearance preserves all nature.

(3) Psalm 45, 8. "Today if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts." Comp. with Heb. 3, 13. "Exhort one another daily while it is called Today lest any of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin." We reason: The present day is destined by God for any sinner to repent.

Every present day is the Today. Therefore God wants any sinner to repent during his life.

(4) Psalm 23, 6. "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life." Dr. Geier tersely explains these words. In this passage, the ardor of divine grace is shown which follows us who are careless, yea, even turn away and avidiously flee, which takes the first steps in behalf of the unwilling, that they may will the good, which aids the willing that he may finish the work, and which follows after him that works that he may persevere. And at no day does it fail the sinner. If you say that these words must be understood of the penitent sinner we reply: We add these words to show that the universal grace of God follows the sinner his whole life. We nevertheless know that God exhorts the most contumacious to repent, which we also teach.

(5) Jer. 3, 1. "They say if a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's wife, shall he return unto her again? Shall not the land be greatly polluted; but thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return to me saith the Lord." So unusual and stupendous is the mercy of God that He recalls to Himself and stimulates to repentance the soul which is polluted with continued and mortal sins as an adulteress who is defiled with many lovers.

(6) The hearers of Isaiah were blinded and hardened. Isa. 6, 19. Nevertheless with uplifted voice he cries out: Let the wicked man forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord; and I will have mercy on him, and our God will abundantly pardon.

Proof for (d) (1) 1 Cor. 6, 9. "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Be not deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God; and such were some of you. But ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God." By these words the apostle teaches us that the most wicked men are preceded by the grace of God and led back to repentance and are translated from the state of wrath into the state of grace.



(2) By their unbelief the Jews like barren branches were cast off from the Olive Tree, Christ, Rom. 9, 17; yet God is able to graft them in again, verse 23, of whom very many were converted, even those who hissed at the apostles as they preached. Acts 2, 42.

(3) The Ninevites whose wickedness ascended to God, came to their senses at the preaching of Jonah and received forgiveness of their sins. Jer. 3, 10.

(4) The most obstinate sinners have been converted. Manasseh was hardened to the last degree; David fell twice grievously, twice he received pardon; Solomon was enticed to idolatry; Nebuchadnezzar misled others, the very vile harlot, Luke 7, and very many others. The example of Paul must not be passed over in silence. He says about himself, 1 Tim. 1, 15, I am the chief of sinners. "Howbeit, I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ may show forth all long suffering for a pattern to them that should hereafter believe on Him to like eternal life."

Proof for (e). That the sinner rushes into eternal ruin by voluntary guilt, and not by a divine decree absolutely denying converting grace, the most merciful God everywhere in the Scriptures teaches. Jer. 32, 33. "But they have turned unto me the back, not the face, though I taught them, rising up early and teaching them; yet they have not hearkened to receive instruction." Matt. 23, 37. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that stonest the prophets and killest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children, even as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." By sending holy ministers God seriously and earnestly desires to convert the most wicked sinners. But so great is the contumacy of many that they repel the grace of God and despise saving grace.

A doctrine contrary to the above was held by the Novatians, who held that there was not a return to repentance open for those who fell after baptism. In our days the Socinians deny the possibility of renewing those to repentance who once shook off the yoke of sin, who afterwards fell into mortal sin and were so entangled by it as to acquire the habit of sinning. Their arguments we will now weigh.

I. He who hardens sinners does not wish to convert them; but God hardens them; therefore He does not will to convert them. The minor premise appears from Isa. 6, 10

and from the example of Pharaoh, Ex. 10, 1. We reply: (1) He who effectively hardens sinners by giving their hearts a hardness, does not will to convert them. But God is said to harden partly permissively, by permitting a just judgment, so that the sinner who does not suffer himself to be softened, left to himself remains hardened; partly negatively, by withdrawing regenerating, justifying and sanctifying grace as a penalty for former sins. (2) Pharaoh hardened himself. Ex. 8, 15, i. e., actively. Therefore, God in another way concurred in the hardening, i. e., Pharaoh effectively and directly; God permissively and indirectly.

II. He who deserts the sinner and withdraws from him his grace, does not will to convert him. But God deserts the hardened sinner and withdraws from him His grace. The minor premise appears from the example of Pharaoh and from 2 Chron. 12, 5. "Ye have forsaken me; therefore have I also left you in the hands of Shishak." Also from 2 Chron. 15, 2. If ye forsake the Lord He will also forsake you. We reply: (1) Although God withdrew from Pharaoh indwelling grace, yet He did not leave him destitute of assisting grace while he was living; since by word and miracles He reminded him of his duty; and showed him His grace. See Calov on this passage. (2) On the withdrawal of divine grace Dr. Huelsemann clearly speaks in his dissertation on Sin, §5. By no means does God so withdraw grace as to leave none at all, or withdraw everything prohibiting sin; because He leaves the law by which it is prohibited, and which is written in nature and is prescribed to all; also by threats of punishment as well as by examples of His judgments against sin He recalls all; and finally for those who live in sin even against conscience He leaves an exciting grace which admonishes them to return to their former state of sonship. This we conclude from the same context 2 Chron. 12, 6. "Whereupon the princes of Israel and the king humbled themselves; and they said the Lord is righteous. And when the Lord saw that they humbled themselves, the word of the Lord came to Shemaiah saying, they have humbled themselves, therefore I will not destroy them." The same can be shown from 2 Chron. 15, 3.

III. He who does not will to hear the cry of sinners does not intend their conversion. God does not will to hear the cries of hardened sinners. The minor premise is proved by Prov. 1, 28: "They shall call upon Me; but I will not an-

swer; they shall seek Me early but shall not find Me." We reply: On account of an urgent calamity the impious cry out because of their impatience at their punishment, not because of a serious purpose of turning to God. They ask God to deliver them from punishment, not from guilt. The cry of a penitent heart is surely heard by God. For all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. Joel 3, 5.

IV. God does not want to deliver those whom He gives over to a reprobate mind. But He gives hardened sinners over to a reprobate mind. Rom. 1, 28; Ps. 81, 12, 13. We reply: The most benignant God invites by His antecedent will to repentance those sinners whom He gives over to a reprobate mind by His consequent judiciary will. Rom. 2, 4. For the antecedent or merciful will is not blotted out or overturned by the consequent or just will.

V. God took away the talent from the useless servant Matt. 25, 25. Therefore He denied him a heart-converting grace. We reply: By the talent in this passage an increase of grace is meant or a more intense or fruitful degree of grace, not primary assisting grace, i. e., that which stands at the door of the heart and knocks, that it might be opened. Rev. 3, 20.

VI. God is weary with repenting. Jer. 15, 6. Therefore He does not will to give repentance to mortal sinners. We reply: In this passage the discourse is not about denying repentance, but about retracing the decree of removing temporal punishment. God does not will longer to pity and remove punishment, says Vatablus. This appears from the following words, verse 7: "And I will fan them with a fan in the gates of the land; I will bereave them of children; I will destroy My people, since they turn not from their ways." This we learn from Jer. 18, 7. 8. "At what instant I will speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom to pluck up, and to pull down and destroy it. If that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do unto them."

VII. Those cannot be converted, for whom one must not pray. But one must not pray for the hardened. Jer. 7, 6; comp. 11, 14 and 14, 11. We reply: God does not forbid prayer for sinners and for pardon for their guilt through faith in the Messiah (for God wills that this be done and promises to hear. Jer. 29, 12. 13). but He forbids prayer for the removal of temporal punishment and deportation

to Babylon for the obstinate Jews. But this temporal punishment is a genuine preaching of repentance.

To this reply the answer has been given: But not rarely does temporal punishment have as its accompaniment eternal punishment; because in flagrant sin men have been destroyed as Zimri and Cozbi Num. 25, 15. We reply: Our discussion is about sinners in this life whom the long-suffering of God draws to repentance; and not about those who are finally impenitent, who die in impenitence; or death setting in they are taken away in an illegal act; for in the hour of death it is fixed that the gate of mercy and pardon is closed to sinners.

VIII. He who swears that those who always err shall not enter His heavenly rest does not will to convert them. But God so swears Heb. 3, 11. 12. We reply that those who always err are finally impenitent, whom God by His judiciary will reprobates; whom yet as long as they live He stimulates to repentance by His antecedent will.

IX. To him who is already judged and condemned the door of grace is closed. But every one who does not believe is judged already. The minor premise flows from John 3, 18. We reply: (1) He who does not finally, i. e., up to the end of his life believe, is condemned already by God's reprobatory decree made in eternity. But we are now treating of those who are not believers at the end of life. (2) He who does not for a time believe is already judged by the law; because the judgment brought in by the law presses him down, nor is he freed from it as long as he is an unbeliever. For although through Christ the Redeemer liberation from the curse of the law was brought into existence for him, whence he can and ought through faith in Christ apply it to himself, yet he does not enjoy it, because he does not by faith embrace the freedom which was wrought by the Savior and offered to him by the Gospel. But a sinner unbelieving for a time, can indeed be converted and led to faith which the examples of David, Peter, Thomas, Paul and others teach.

X. That divine grace is denied those who repent too late, the example of the five foolish virgins shows, on whom coming too late the door was closed. Matt. 25, 10. We reply in the words of Gerhard's Harmony, chap. 163, page 836: Primarily and chiefly Christ here speaks of the state of affairs on the judgment day, when already the time of repentance and grace is past. But if we wish to apply this part of the parable to the death of a person it must be said

that then already the gate is closed and the time of repentance, grace, and pardon is ended, since the body is separated from the soul.

XI. That converting grace is not offered to all hardened sinners is clear from the example of Eli's sons who did not obey the voice of their father, because God willed to destroy them. 1 Sam. 2, 25. And from the example of Saul whom God wholly deserted, so that He did not answer him by dreams, by Urim or by prophets. We reply: (1) God did not absolutely cut off recalling grace from Eli's sons whom He seriously intended to recall to repentance by His Word announced by means of their father. But the words of the text here quoted are simply translated by Dr. Sebastian Schmid and read thus: Eli's sons obeyed not the voice of their father; because God wished to destroy them. (2) Saul remained under the shadow of the visible Church and therefore was moved to repentance by the law and by the burnt offering, although that special divine grace, by which God in the Old Testament was wont to reveal the future was not vouchsafed him.

XII. Esau found no place for repentance though he sought it with tears. Heb. 12, 16. Therefore God does not will to give all sinners repentance. We reply: This passage does not treat of Esau's repentance (his tears prove that he repented of his rash deed), but of Isaac's repentance; for though he sought it with tears yet Esau found no place for repentance, i. e., that his father would be sorry for the benediction of the right of primogeniture which was given to Jacob, and revoke it. To this answer the objection has been made: Esau vainly seeking this change (repentance) in his father is a type of the sinner seeking but not finding forgiveness of sins with God the Father. We reply: Esau typically does not represent every fallen man, but the one who sins against the Holy Spirit, by whom a return is denied to every one who mortally falls.

XIII. God denies recalling grace to sinners against the Holy Ghost. Heb. 6, 6; 10, 26. Therefore He does not will to convert all hardened sinners. We reply: Sinners against the Holy Spirit are finally impenitent not because of being denied recalling grace, but because of voluntary and persevering rejection of the ordinary means, i. e., the Word of God, by which they must be converted. Therefore Dannhauer gravely says: It is impossible that sinners against the Holy Spirit be renewed to repentance, not by

an impossibility of a reprobatory, absolute and peremptory decree, but of human vice.

XIV. Sinners living outside of the pale of the Church are not recalled to repentance by the ordinary means. Therefore the converting grace of God is not universal. We reply: The nations who live outside of the pale of the Church and are not recalled to repentance by the solemn preaching of the Word of God cannot accuse the most merciful God who deeply desires all men's repentance, but their ancestors, who, as was fitting did not faithfully preserve the precious deposit of the lamp of the Gospel. But they are called to the Church, the workshop of grace, by nature, conscience and the report of the Christian religion, scattered everywhere in the earth, so that they might through the ordinary means of grace be converted.

XV. There seems to stand against us the authority of Luther who says: Though God promised pardon as Augustine says, yet He did not promise this that those would return after falling, as Saul and Judas did not return. We reply: (a) If God promised forgiveness to a sinner, He did not cut him off from all grace. For the Gospel promise by which pardon is offered to the sinner, is the efficacious means of conversion. (b) God did not promise that the sinner would certainly return to repentance, because He converts a sinner, not by irresistible, but by resistible grace through the ordinary means, which a sinner can reject.

Question 13. Strictly speaking, what is the condition from which and to which conversion takes a sinner?

Strictly speaking, the condition from which conversion takes a person is, on the one hand, actual sins, in so far as, after they are committed, they morally remain as approved or not retracted; (a) on the other hand, habitual sins, in so far as they not only show the lack of a habitual perfection which ought to be present, but also a propensity to all evil, and therefore are the source and cause of actual sin; (b) the near condition to which conversion takes a sinner is contrition; (c) the remote is faith in Christ.

Note 1. Sins can be viewed from two standpoints: (1) physically, in as far as they are actions and efficiently depend on man; (2) morally, in as far as they are acts against the law and concern the right of some third person. Viewed in first sense, they have this in common with all other acts, that they denote a man in some respect which is related to him as the effect is to its cause; so that when

they are committed, they denote that one sins in the present; but after they have been committed, that one has sinned in the past. But considered in the second sense, they have this peculiarity of other moral acts which, besides the agent, concern the right of some third person; that they indicate an obligation in the agent and bind the sinner, after they have passed, to the actor rather than to the state resulting from the act; e. g., as in civil things, a contract that is once made puts an obligation on those who have made it and holds them bound to the conditions of the contract, even though the act of contracting is passed; so sin once committed puts an obligation on the sinner and holds him bound in the state of sin, though the act of sinning is passed. Since indeed the will of man is changeable, and what they at one time do they retract by a change of will; and so far as they can they are wont to render the things morally void; therefore, past sins morally remain and hold a sinner, in the state of sin. It is especially required that afterward through subsequent acts of the will they be regarded as approved, or certainly that they be not retracted through subsequent acts of the will; whence it is required for a contract once made, if it ought morally last, that it be approved by those making it or certainly that it be not retracted by either side of the contract.

Note 2. Not alone approval or non-retraction is the cause for which sins after their commission morally remain, and keep a sinner in the state of sin; for since sins are forbidden by the divine law, and through this fact that they violate God's law, they grieve Him very deeply, they bring on the sinner guilt and the obligation of rendering satisfaction for the offense and the injury done God. Whence neither by their approval or non-retraction alone are they of such a nature that they morally remain, nor can they be destroyed by their retraction alone. For even if a sinner very seriously retracts his past sins, guilt yet remains because of the violated law of God; and he is obligated to make satisfaction for the offense and injury done God. But as long as guilt and the obligation to render satisfaction remain, so long do the sins morally remain, and the man remains in the state of sin. Therefore that sins may be morally destroyed and man be transferred from the state of sin to that of grace, two things are required: (1) that sins be no longer approved but retracted; (2) that a full satisfaction be offered to the Lord, the Most High God, for the offense and injury, and that therefore God who was offended be reconciled.

Proof for (a): Actual sins are so long regarded as approved as they so please the unconverted sinner that he indulges in and works them either because he does not know that they are prohibited by the divine law, or because they soothe him with the form of appearing good; e. g., the gentiles did not know that their idolatry was forbidden by God's law (though this ignorance might have been flat, dense and affected). The enemies of the Gospel thought that by killing the apostles they did God a holy service, John 16, 2. Avarice for a useful possession pleases not a few; adultery for pleasure, etc. As long as a sinner does not hate or detest these vices, but rather so delights in them that he decides to walk and persevere in them, so long do these actual sins morally remain, though physically or really they are past; and they keep a man in the state of sin.

Proof for (b): Actual sins are the immediate and near, while habitual sins are the mediate and remote condition from which conversion takes the sinner; for since actual sins, when committed, are observed by the sinner per se and immediately, and burden and grieve his conscience; but since the habit of sinning is known from the former, i. e., actual sins whose source and cause it is, conversion is carried by her acts over to the former and tends to destroy them primarily and soonest and immediately, yet so that by consequence and by mediate acts of sinning, conversion is carried to the latter, the habit of sinning as to a remote condition which is connoted in actual sins as a near condition, because it is their source. So David, after murdering and committing adultery, repenting of his evil deeds, besides the evils committed in act and already past, also seriously and painfully disapproved and detested their connoted evil as the cause and source of the acts: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. 51, 7.

Proof for (c): Thus it is the office of the law like a hammer to break and crush the stony hearts, Jer. 23, 29; to pronounce the wrath of God on the transgressor of the law, Rom. 4, 15; and to condemn them to death, 2 Cor. 3, 6. So the condition to which conversion takes one through the law, and its first and immediate effect is contrition by which a sinner seriously and painfully bewails his sins made known to him by God's law. When, therefore, the Holy Spirit by the divine law leads a sinner to contrition, the latter no longer approves his past sins, but retracts them. Retraction is made up of two acts of which one per-



tains to the intellect and the other to the will. Knowledge of sin which pertains to the intellect is in the first place required as a necessary condition without which a retraction of sin finds no place. Therefore, David says: "I acknowledge my transgression and my sin is ever before me" (as something abominable, detestable and retractable). Ps. 51, 5. This knowledge of sin is the effect of illuminating grace. On the part of the will for the retraction of sins displeasure on their account is required which is either simple or efficacious. Simple displeasure is that by which according to the manner of evil when known, the will is displeased somewhat without bringing about the intention of fleeing it. Efficacious displeasure is that by which the thing known as evil displeases the will so that it at once intends to flee it. A simple displeasure does not suffice for retracting sins; because this is found in impenitent persons who see and approve the good but do the evil. But efficacious displeasure joined with the serious purpose of fleeing sin is also required, by which we so turn from sin that not only do we wish to undo the sins that are committed, if this could be done, but we also turn away with our whole heart from committing all other sins in the future. This displeasure we are wont to call detestation for sin, for this detestation or efficacious displeasure (by which sins, even if, while they are committed, they should be voluntary, are put in the nature of unwillful sins), pains and sorrow of soul are accustomed to follow (to which pertain the bites and fears of conscience) the more grievous sins as the sinner more fully considers his sins, an offended God and the merited punishments of this and the next life.

Proof for (d): As the law is our schoolmaster to lead us unto Christ (Gal. 3, 24), so contrition is a certain disposition useful and necessary to kindle faith in the sinner and to obtain salvation. So says Musaeus, with whom Dr. Fecht agrees: Repentance strictly taken (contrition) in a good sense the theologians do not fear to call a disposition and preparation for faith and a means of attaining faith, Matt. 3, 5, Acts 3, 48, i. e., contrition is not a positive or causal means of kindling faith, but is only a privative means (such as making way for the pure goes toward healing the wound) by which the incapacity of the subject and obstacles are removed which otherwise impede the kindling of faith. For God looks unto the broken and contrite heart, Isa. 66, 2. And so faith in Christ is the remote condition to which conversion takes a person. Therefore the Holy

Spirit by working contrition through the law intends to dispose the heart of the sinner to the kindling of saving faith by the gospel. But when I call it remote I do not wish any one to think that faith must be removed from contrition, or that they be separated. In the sermons of Christ contrition is joined to faith with the closest connection. "Repent and believe the gospel" (Mark 1, 15, Acts 2, 28, 2 Cor. 7, 10). But this indeed is meant that not through conversion by the law but through regeneration by the gospel the light of faith arises, 1 Pet. 1, 23, James 1, 18.

Question 14. In what does conversion taken in its strictest sense formally consist?

Conversion mostly strictly taken consists in working of contrition through the law, by means of which the hard heart of the sinner is softened by the Holy Spirit, prepared and disposed for the kindling in it of faith by the gospel.

Proof: These things appear already from the words of the Apology Müller, page 112, line 21, seqq.: That faith of which we speak consists of repentance, that is, it is embraced in terrors of conscience which feels the wrath of God against our sins and seeks forgiveness of and freedom from sin. And in such terrors and other afflictions this faith must grow and be strengthened. Therefore, it cannot live in those who walk according to the flesh, who delight in their lusts and obey them.

Question 15. What is the purpose of conversion?

The near purpose of conversion is regeneration (a) its ultimate purpose on man's part is eternal life (b) on God's part, the glory of the divine name (c).

Proof for (a): Since conversion through the law excites in the sinner contrition which disposes one toward the kindling of faith, it clearly appears that the Holy Spirit by crushing the hard heart intends the regeneration of the contrite sinner. This we have shown lucidly above from Acts 2, 28, question 5, proof 4.

Proof for (b): "Godly sorrow worketh repentance not to be repented of," 2 Cor. 7, 10. God through converting grace by making the sinner contrite through the law works repentance to salvation; namely that repentance taken in part, or contrition is indeed not the causal means of salvation; but it is the means of the divine order. This order we have explained under question 9.

Proof for (c): "When the apostles and brethren which were in Judea heard that the gentiles also received the Word of God, they praised God saying, God hath also given the gentiles repentance unto life," Acts 11, 18. We must praise the goodness of God who seeks the wandering sheep and receives the harlot returning to Him. Jer. 3, 1.

Question 16. Does God convert the sinner by irresistible grace?

Sinners can resist converting grace.

Note I. Distinguish between natural and malicious resistance. The former is sometimes called congenital and immediately flows from the corrupt nature of man and is common to all men, which through preparing grace joined with the Word of God is lessened and kept down, but is not entirely destroyed. For there is a striving of the flesh against the spirit even in the regenerated. Rom. 17, 23, Gal. 5, 17. Man therefore through the corruption of his nature cannot but resist the law of God; for the flesh is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be. Rom. 8, 7. Converting grace breaks this necessity of resistance and brings it about that a man can indeed admit the means, but not that he admits them necessarily or irresistibly, but he retains the liberty of resisting these means. The second kind of resistance is called willful, effected, morose and it is exerted with the peculiar guilt of man and purposely and therefore is truly contracted by voluntary malice. In some it is more, in others it is less pertinacious, in some it is temporal, in others it is final. The Savior teaches that the rich shall with more difficulty enter the kingdom of heaven than the poor (Matt. 19, 23); that the publicans and harlots can be more easily converted than the Pharisees, since the latter were inflated with self-righteousness. Matt. 21, 31. None the less do we learn from experience that men who hold false opinions, who are inflamed with a wild zeal or immersed in grievous vices oftener fall into especially monstrous sins, more vehemently resist converting grace than those who hold themselves away from those kinds of dangers to their salvation. Those who resist pertinaciously are those who are finally impenitent, among whom those who sin against the Holy Spirit are chief.

Note 2. Some authors think that extraordinary conversions were irresistible. Others call them doubtful. That the extraordinary conversion of Paul was not irresistible we conclude from Acts 26, 19, where the apostle says: "I

was not disobedient to the heavenly vision," by which words he hints that, had he willed, he could have resisted. Such a powerful call did not take from him the power of resisting, says Hugo Grotius, commenting on this passage. Nor is there a reason why Paul could have resisted this heavenly vision less than Moses could resist the divine call even while the anger of the Lord was kindled. Dr. Huelsemann distinguishes between the call and the conversion of Paul. Paul's call was indeed extraordinarily made, but not irresistibly were his conversion and regeneration made. Acts 9, 4, seqq. For the former was made in an instant, but the latter was made successively (in about three days). Hence we must not reason from the extraordinary and miraculous to the irresistible, for many resist miracles.

Note 3. Distinguish between actual and possible resistance. Grace is called resistible, because one can by nature resist it, whether he actually resists it or not. Irresistible grace one cannot resist by nature.

Note 4. Since man lies in mortal sins and daily lives in security, not at all thinking of his conversion, the most merciful God precedes him and by means of the word, heard or read, and retained in memory He awakes in him good motives which theologians call inevitable because their presence and sense cannot be evaded, which also can in a sense be called irresistible because of their origin and sense; since the sinner cannot oppose himself to their suscitation through the word nor to their sense, but only to consent to them. "The first motives," says Musaeus, "can be called irresistible, since they precede our deliberation, so that it is not in our power to prevent their arising, although after they have arisen they can be resisted and impeded so that they take no root or be wholly choked. But these good motives which prevenient grace kindles in the sinner within the pale of the Church by the word, consist in compunction of the heart, Acts 2, 13, or in some injection of a stimulus, and in the wakening of an internal monition contrary to all intention of the sinner about the great danger and atrocious misery to which the sinner freely exposed himself through his crimes daily committed against conscience, as, for example, the prodigal son came to himself (Luke 15, 25) and being frightened (Acts 24, 25) pricked in his conscience, and terrified he begins to groan, "What shall I do? Where shall I run? Where am I headlong borne? Why did I not think about my eternal salvation rather than thinking about my body's pleasure, joined with the danger of eternal pain?"

God so disposes things by His great grace that room for excuse is left to nobody. The most obstinate atheists who harden themselves against all argument of Christians, yet contrary to their own wills, when, as it were, that they are dumbfounded by a proposition of the divine Word, feel such twitching within themselves.

Note 5. Non-resistance is of two kinds, pedagogical and spiritual. Pedagogical non-resistance is in the power of the sinner in the external things of the Church. E. g. some unconverted people refuse to walk to the church; others do not. This pedagogical non-resistance answering to external hearing is of the free will; but spiritual non-resistance answering to the internal hearing or assent is of the assisting and preparing grace of the Holy Spirit; because this breaks and hinders natural, actual and simple resistance so that it does not become malicious, effected and morose, although through the malice of men it does not always attain this intended purpose.

Proof (1): Acts 1, 51. "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit." This heavenly passage is very emphatic. The primary emphasis is on the word stiff-necked. The metaphor is taken from bulls impatient of the yoke and petulantly shaking it off when it is put on. The secondary emphasis is on the word circumcised (spiritually). Externally the Jews were circumcised; but internally they nourished an uncircumcised heart. Those who indulge in vicious desires of the heart are uncircumcised in heart. Jer. 9, 26. They are uncircumcised in ear whose ears itch to hear either new doctrines or obscene and vile words. The tertiary emphasis is on the word "resist," i. e., the Holy Ghost. "Ye oppose and obstruct His entrance into into your heart."

Proof (2): Isa. 65, 2, comp. with Rom. 10, 20. The whole day I stretch out my hands to a rebellious people which walk in a way that is not good and after their own thoughts. "They are wont to stretch out their hands who willingly offer benefits to others; they invite and draw them to themselves and are about to receive them to their embrace and bosom." This God does the whole day, i. e., all the time by offering assisting grace, even to those who break away, who please themselves with their own designs, not crushing their desires into subjection to God.

Proof (3): Matt. 23, 37. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets. . . . how often would I have

gathered your children together even as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings; but ye would not. With these words Christ shows (a) His especially serious will to gather and convert the Jews. For as in the hen there is a tender and ardent love by which she desires the safety of her chickens, so Christ with true and sincere love was disposed to gather the citizens of Jerusalem under the wings of His grace; (b) He complains of their willful hardness for morosely rejecting the proffered grace.

A doctrine contrary to this is taught by some scholastics, Jansenists and others who assert that converting grace is irresistible. Their leading arguments are the following: (1) Paul distinctly says, "Who can resist His will?" Rom. 9, 19. We reply Paul does not say these words of himself, but they are taken from the mouth of an antagonist, to whom the apostle replies (a) indirectly by an oath that man ought not reply against God (b) by telling that God does not positively harden in sending irresistible hardness to hearts; but invites to repentance by bearing with much kindness and patience the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction by their own guilt.

(2) That power which is no less efficacious and strong than that which exercised itself in awaking Christ from the dead is insuperable and irresistible. But the power of the Holy Spirit is no less efficacious and strong than that which wakened Christ from the dead. The major premise is proved by the fact that the divine power by which Christ was wakened from the dead was clearly irresistible and insuperable, it being used in the act the effect could not but follow. The minor appears from Col. 2, 12, and Eph. 1, 19-20. We reply: The power raising Christ's body from the dead corresponds to converting grace as far as the substance of the divine power, considered in itself, is concerned, because (a) each is supernatural; (b) each gives life; the former gave the glorified body life, the latter the converted soul life; but they differ in their subjects, because the body of Christ as such or exactly considered was destitute of life; but the soul dead in sin is destitute of the life of grace, but not of the life of this world. It lacks spiritual life but not natural life. Hence the dead body of Christ did not battle with the divine resurrection power, but the soul, infatuated and, as it were, drunk with the love of this world, does strive against grace.

(3) The power that is far greater than human strength can be resisted by nobody. But divine converting power is

far greater than human strength. The major premise follows, thus the less strength is forced to concede to the greater. The minor is evident, for divine grace converting the heart is infinite, while human power is finite. We reply: We concede that that strength which is by far superior to human power and works absolutely can be resisted by nobody. But divine converting grace is not absolute but ordinate, working by ordinary means which can be resisted by man. To our answer it has been objected: By this reason a man resisting divine power will either be more powerful than God or at least equally powerful. But God is more powerful than man. We reply: (a) If a man would resist by a greater or equal perfection that would follow. But man resists by blindness of intellect and stolid conceptions, by disorder of appetite and malice of will; which do not argue perfection, but an impotence. This is made clear by an example: God sustains natural life not by absolute, but by ordinate power, i. e., by means of food, for if anybody would go so far in his senselessness as to refuse to eat food he would through his folly resist the divine order, but would not be more powerful than God; (b) even then when the power of God is impeded, He can so act that it be not impeded, if He wished to act irresistibly. Therefore it is not right to infer that there is something more powerful than God; for as God permits His ordinate power to be overcome by the opposition of a malicious hindrance, so His absolute power is insuperable.

(4) He in whose hands are the hearts of men that He may bend them as He wills cannot be resisted by men. But the hearts of men are in God's hands that He may bend them as He wills. The major premise is proved thus: He who bends anything at his will attains the end of this bending without resistance. The minor appears from Prov. 21. 1. "The heart of the king is in God's hand as the rivers of water; He turneth it whithersoever He wills." We reply: In this passage Solomon does not speak of converting grace, but of divine providence in the affairs of kings whose hearts God turns as often as seems good to Him. And yet this bending of the king's heart is not absolutely irresistible, which appears from the example of Saul, who resisted the divine command.

(5) He whom the Father draws to the Son does not resist (for God does not draw the unwilling) but draws sinners to the Son. John 6, 44. We reply: God does not draw the unwilling, but those unwilling by nature He makes

willing by grace. But since the one drawn is not violently taken, but is borne by the ordinary ropes of grace, it is simply resistible; for it requires a drawable subject, not one morosely resisting or cutting the ropes of grace.

6. If a man can and does not resist converting grace, contrition and faith depend on the natural powers of free will. The conclusion is Pelagian, therefore the condition also is Pelagian. The conclusion of the major premise is so proved; not to resist is the same as to repent and believe. We reply: (a) By denying the conclusion of the major. To the proof we say that non-resistance is only a condition without which contrition and faith are not produced in the heart of the sinner; but is not itself contrition and faith; (b) Pedagogic non-resistance in the externals of the Church depends on free will; spiritual non-resistance is of grace.

(7) If a man can resist converting grace, God is foiled of His purpose; but God is never foiled of His purpose. The major premise is clear, for resistance impedes the purpose of the agent. The consequence is thus proved: No wise and powerful person intends a thing which he knows will be foiled. But God is most wise and powerful; and therefore foreknows the outcome of conversion and can attain His purpose by working it. Therefore, He is never foiled of it. We reply: God always attains His ultimate and general end, i. e., the manifesting of His glorious grace, though He does not always attain His intermediate and special purposes, i. e., the repentance of the sinner; yet divine wisdom reduces this foiling of His special purpose to His ultimate purpose, i. e., the glory of His severe justice which the man, pertinaciously resisting, provokes.

### PRAYER.

Convert, O most kind God, the sinners who are turned from Thee. Crush the ferocious, bend the contumacious, and raise the fallen! Recall, O most mild Father, Thy disobedient children, gather together the scattered doves, and lead back the wandering sheep. Soften their iron hearts with the fire of the Word; break the stony hearts with the hammer of the law, so that they may be disposed and prepared to receive in true faith Jesus the King of souls, the Assertor and Vindicator of our salvation. Restrain my will which is inclined to sin; support my trembling will; confirm my weak will; so that I be and remain in the exercise of the yoke of repentance a hater of all evil, a cultivator of all piety. Amen.



**RECENT BIBLICAL RESEARCH.**

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

**JESUS AS A SATURNALIA KING.**

When Pilate had passed judgment on Jesus, the soldiers "took Him into the common room" (Matt. 27, 27), i. e. the "Pretorium," or the barracks. And there were assembled the whole cohort, 600 men (or possibly only a third part, a maniple, at any rate, several hundred men), and engaged in a series of masqueradings with Him; ending in a mock salutation to Him as a King. How did the soldiers come to indulge in this peculiar manner of sport with Jesus? That a condemned felon was made the object of mockery by his executioners has been quite common in antiquity and at later times. How does it come that the soldiers adopted this peculiar method of mockery? A reference to Philo, (In Floccum, Ed. Höschel, p. 970) furnishes us with a singular parallel to this mockery of Christ in the similar process resorted to in the case of an anti-Semitic tribunal in Alexandria, the victim being King Herod Agrippa I. The account reads as follows:

"There lived at that time in Alexandria a crazy man by the name of Karabas, not possessed of wild and brutal insanity, but of a mild type of the disorder. This man was accustomed night and day to sit naked in the streets, no matter what the heat or cold was, and thus afforded amusement to the populace. This poor man they drove into the gymnasium and placed him on an elevated stand, so that all could see him. Then they put upon his head a crown of byblos reeds, and covered his body, instead of his chlamys [same term in Matt.] with a sort of a sheet, and put into his hand a short piece of ordinary papyrus rod, such as can be found on the street anywhere, to be used as a sceptre. When he had thus been dressed up as a king, two youths with sticks on their shoulders walked by his side as a bodyguard. Then others approached and made their salutations to him as a king, some as though they were petitioning for a favor and others as though asking an audience. Finally a shout arose in the assembled multitude, and the word was heard 'Marin' (for this is the term by which the Syrians mean Lord, or Master). For it was known that Agrippa was a native Syrian and ruled over a large district of Syria."

In this person then of Karabas the Roman soldiers of Alexandria mocked the Jewish King Agrippa, and the re-

markable parallel between the method and way it was done and that pursued in the case of Jesus provokes closer investigation. Paul Wendland, one of the most recent editors of Philo's works, finds this explanation in the celebration of the Saturnalia festival by the Roman soldiers. On this occasion the participants were accustomed to select a king, whose orders must be obeyed by all, but whose commands consisted in silly demands made of his frolicking companions at the banquets. The details of such a festival have only lately been made accessible by the discovery and publication of the Martyr Acts of Saint Dasius (Cf. *Hermes*, Vol. 33). The facts are these: It was customary in the Roman army every year to celebrate the festival of Kronos (Saturn). By lot one of the number was selected, who was clothed in royal garment and dressed up as Kronos, and who then for thirty (?) days was the leader in all kinds of unbridled amusements, but after the close of this period was executed with the sword.

It is doubtless this festival that furnished the soldiers the model in the case of Jesus. He was by them dressed up as a masqueraded Saturnalia King, to furnish them amusement. The same was doubtless the case in the instance of Karabas. But why does the Saturnalia King die? He is the earthly image of Saturn. He dies as do Osiris, Samson, as Hercules and Adonis, as Baldur and as Siegfried. The god of the sun who bestows the blessings must die. The death of the sun-god has often been compared with that of Jesus. Here we can see how the only mythus of the death of the sun-god with its old ceremonies and celebration had an historically demonstrated influence on the actual sufferings of Jesus. He who according to the faith of the Christians was the dying God, Him the heathens have mocked by an imitation of the cultus of their dying God.

This is one of the most recent sidelight facts for New Testament research, and has been made available chiefly through the abundant papyri finds in Egypt, which contain such a mass of literary matter contemporaneous with the Biblical writing of this period. It is of the same kind as that described by Harnack, in which it was shown that the way in which the glory of Jesus is described is an adaptation from the methods common in the case of the deification of the Cæsars. The probabilities are that not a few New Testament expressions and facts that now seem enigmatical will find their solution in data from these new sources.

## THE PAPYRI FINDS.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, discovered by Grenfel and Hurst in the ruins of ancient Oxyrhynchus, the modern Behnesa, in Central Egypt, of which the first volume, with translations and notes prepared by the discoverers, has been published by the Egypt Exploration Fund, Græco-Roman Branch, contains such a rich abundance of valuable documents of almost endless variety, dating from the times of Augustus down to the eighth century, that the study of these writings promises a rich harvest for the understanding of the historical background of the New Testament period. So far 207 documents have been published, of which No. 1-6 are called "the logical" texts; 7-15 contain new classical fragments; 16-29 fragments from known classical Greek writers; 30-32 are Latin fragments; 33-124 a large collection of non-literary Greek texts of the first four Christian centuries; 125-158, similar documents from the early Byzantine period; 159-207 non-literary Papyri of various kinds. Naturally the first class is the most important. The first number are the *Logia* of Christ discovered two years ago; the second is the first sheet of an uncial manuscript of Matthew, from the beginning of the fourth, or, more probably, the close of the third century. This would accordingly then be the oldest written specimen of a New Testament book, or part of a book, as it contains Matth. i, 1-9, 12, 14-20, but not complete. The text is closely akin to the Sinaiticus and the Vatican. No. 3 is a parchment and contains an uncial text of Mark 10, 50-51, and 11, 11-12 dating from the fifth or sixth century and representing the A text. No. 4 contains a fragment speaking of a higher and a lower soul, which Harnack, in the Reports of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, 1898, 516-520 claims to be a gnostic fragment, while No. 5 contains a citation valuable for the text criticism of Pastor Hermæ (Mand. 11, 9-10) the remnants of a book on prophecy, possibly from the pen of Melito of Sardes, of value on account of its description of primitive "enthusiastic" Christianity. Deismann is of the conviction that the close of this document is a collation from Matt. 22, 43. No. 6 is a parchment sheet containing chaps. 8 and 9 of the Acts of St. Paul and Thecla, but with unique readings.

The so-called "classical" fragments represent a number of authors from the first to the fifth Christian century, namely Sappho, Alcman, Aristoxenos, Thucydides, Herodotus, Sophocles, Plato, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Xenophon, Euclid, Vergil. There are further unidentified remnants of

comedies, elegies, epigrammes, historical, meteorological works. The so-called "non-literary" remains are of great value for the study of the world of thought and action in which the New Testament writers lived and moved and had their being. Among these of special interest is one giving particulars of an anti-Jewish embassy to a Roman Emperor from Alexandria. Other kinds of documents are official day books, public promulgations, tax lists, and public and private writings of various kinds, including petitions, testaments, protocols, letters, receipts, invitation cards, papers of manumission of slaves, etc. Deissmann, who reports on these finds in an enthusiastic tone, in the *Theol. Litteraturzeitung*, No. 24, claims that these non-literary documents are really more valuable for the study of the period of the New Testament and of the early Church than are the literary.

#### A GOLDEN GOSPEL MANUSCRIPT.

The so-called purple New Testament manuscripts, in many of which the letters were written with silver ink and only the first letters of a book or a chapter with golden, have all along been regarded as the gems among this class of documents. Now the discovery of the first manuscript in existence that has been written entirely in golden letters has aroused the interest of Bible scholars to an unusual degree. The details and particulars of this unique find are given in the *Journal des Savants*, May, 1900, by H. Ormont, who publishes his description also in pamphlet form, as *Manuscrit Gres de l'Evangile S. Matthieu, en lettres onciales d'or sur parchemin pourpre* (A Greek Manuscript of St. Matthew, in uncial letters of gold on purple parchment), and promises to publish a fac-simile edition in the near future. From this source we glean the following:

The manuscript was discovered only last December by the French Captain de la Taille, in Sinope, Asia Minor, and is now in the possession of the National Library in Paris. The Captain was on his way to Russia and Armenia, and accidentally discovered this purple document of 43 sheets. It is the only document of its kind, namely a manuscript written from beginning to end in golden letters. The size of the sheets is 30 by 25 centimetres, and rather remarkably each page contains only one column. The entire fragment that has so far been found contains extracts from the gospel of St. Matthew, namely from chapters 7 and 11, and large

extracts from chapters 13 to 24. The whole document must have included 144 sheets, and is a portion of whole gospel codex, the rest of which may yet be discovered. The writing is simply magnificent and from an artistic point of view one of the finest in existence, resembling in many particulars the famous Codex N. The size of the letters is seven millimetres high. The beauty of the manuscript is materially increased by five exceptionally fine miniatures on the bottom of five pages, representing scenes from gospel history, such as the slaying of John the Baptist, the miracle of the loaves and fishes, and others. These are doubtlessly the product of a painting school at Constantinople, and the date of the documents is probably the last years of the reign of Justinian. Harnack closes an account of this new find in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, No. 14, with these words:

It is a matter of great joy to learn that Asia Minor still contains such literary treasures, but it is also a matter of deep regret that not the whole writing but only fragments have been discovered.

The well known American-German specialist of Leipzig, the author of Tischendorf's Prolegomena, Dr. Gregory, gives the find an equally warm welcome in the *Theol. Literaturblatt*, No. 25.

#### BIBLICAL GREEK.

The character of Biblical Greek, both that of the Septuagint and of the New Testament, has been made the object of new researches in recent months from a comparatively new point of view, the object being largely to determine the exact status of this type of Greek, in form, vocabulary and syntax, within the history of Greek literature in general. The tendency has been all along to isolate Biblical Greek from the language of its day and date and bring it into little more than a formal connection with the *κοινή*, while a material connection was sought solely in the Biblical idea world of the Old Testament. Now a somewhat new tendency is being developed, namely to make Biblical Greek a part and portion of Greek literature and to place it into the exact place in the development of Greek where it belongs. This more or less new idea has assumed a somewhat more tangible form on account of new material that has been discovered, largely in the shape of inscriptions and papyri, that enable students to note the relation of Biblical Greek to the literary and more popular type of Greek of its day. Among the investigators in this line has been Dr. Deissmann, of the University of Heidelberg, who has published

two brochures on the subject. The one is entitled: *Die sprachliche Erforschung der griechischen Bibel*, and is devoted especially to the demonstration of the fact that Biblical Greek should be brought into contrast not with "profane," or common Greek, but to classical Greek, and that the recent finds in these departments show that the peculiarities of Biblical Greek, in forms and in vocabulary, and also in syntax in those books which are originally Greek and not translations, agree on the whole with the peculiarities of the latter and as a rule the non-literary Greek. The second work in question is entitled *Neue Bibelstudien*, containing contributions chiefly from inscriptions and papyri on the language of the New Testament. The author remarks that here is a field white for the harvest, especially for New Testament lexicography. The inscriptions used are chiefly those found in Pergamon and the islands of Aegean Sea as also the Egyptian papyri of the Berlin Museum and of the Archduke Rainer in Vienna. A somewhat similar line of thought in reference to Biblical Greek is carried out in many of the paragraphs of the revision of Winer, by Schmiedel, which promises to be a thesaurus on the subject. He devotes a great deal of attention to the later Greek inscriptions, of which hundreds have been discovered in the last few decades. These he uses in illustrating the genesis and character of the New Testament idiom and shows the living connection of the latter with the language of the day. In portions of the book, especially §§ 5-16, Schmiedel shows that what has hitherto been regarded as specifically "New Testament," or "Biblical" Greek is in reality the common language of the age. A Latin work by Auz, entitled *Subsidia ad Cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem*, etc., investigates in detail the use of verbs in the Septuagint translation of Genesis and Exodus, selecting 289 out of a total of 1,003 words of this kind. He too studies these in the light of contemporaneous Greek, particularly the inscriptions, dividing the verbs into three groups, viz., the poetic, the Ionic and the modern, connecting all of them with the current common Greek of the day. Many of these word-studies are of considerable interest. Auz warns against the indiscriminate use of the statistical method in determining the meaning of important words in Biblical Greek, based solely on the use of literary sources illustrating the dangers of this procedure in the case of such words as *ἐπαυέειν* and *καθαρίζειν*. Witkowski, also in a Latin brochure, entitled *Prodromus Grammaticae Papyrorum*, shows particularly that just as little as the Papyri investigations:

can ignore the lxx, just so little the lxx investigations can ignore the papyri. He takes into consideration chiefly the papyri of the Ptolymean period, furnishing valuable data for determining the philological background of the lxx and the New Testament. In this connection it may be interesting to note that Dr. Deissmann, in a recent article on the subject under consideration, declares that Dr. Thayer's English translation and revision of Grimm's *Clavis* is the best New Testament dictionary extant.

---

#### OLD TESTAMENT APOCRAPHA.

In 1894 Professor Kautzsch, of Halle, published a modern translation of the Old Testament, modeled largely after the New Testament version of Weizsäcker, the idea being to produce a rendition of the Biblical text in the methods of expression current in our day and date, and based upon a close exegetical study of the original. The work has been warmly received and has proved to be, in a measure at least, an excellent means of popularizing the results of modern Biblical interpretation and criticism. The editor was assisted in the work of translation by Professors Baethgen, Guthe, Kamphausen, Kittel, Marti, Rothstein, Ruetschi, Ryssel, Siegfried and Socin. Now the same editor has prepared a supplement of great literary importance in the shape of a translation of the Apocrypha and the Pseudopigraphi of the Old Testament, the collection including the whole mass of inter-Testament literature of value and worth for the study of the religious world of the New Testament period, the historical background for the gospels and epistles. The new work will accordingly contain more than the Apocrypha of the Greek Old Testament canon, which Luther too translated and which appear in the majority of German Bible editions. Introductions to the various books will be given as also short documents on the text, making this practically a commentary on the Apocrypha and the Apocalypses of the Old Testament. Kautzsch has been aided by a number of specialists, mostly University men, namely Beer, Blass, Clemen, Deissmann, Fuchs, Gunkel, Guthe, Kamphausen, Kittel, Littmann, Löhr, Rothstein, Ryssel, Schnapp, Siegfried, Wendland. The new volume, which in size and type conforms to the Old Testament version of which it is a supplement, will appear in about 30 hefts, each a half mark, the whole to be published within a year. The publisher is Mohr, of Leipzig and Freiburg.

## THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

A very interesting and instructive resumé of the critical discussions on the gospel of St. John during the past decade, has been begun by A. Meyer, in the *Theologische Rundschau*, No. 7, the opening article to be followed by others. As is the case in regard to the Pastoral Epistles, where the antagonism between the conservative and the liberal schools a generation ago seemed to be irreconcilable, thus in reference to the fourth gospel the antagonism has been steadily decreasing. Attention was drawn to this ten years ago by Schürer, in a special pamphlet that attracted general attention, and in which he claimed that an agreement was possible and even probable, but with a sacrifice of the apostolic origin of this book. At that time already the tendencies to an agreement was pronounced on the basis of mutual concessions, the one party having placed the gospel at least fifty years earlier than had been claimed by Baur and his school, and the other having admitted that the sayings and words of Christ as reported in the gospel had been filtered through and changed by the reflecting thought of the writer. Meyer carefully reviews the works of the past ten years and shows that the hoped-for agreement is nearer consummation than ever, but is evidently being effected without a sacrifice, or at any rate an entire sacrifice of the apostolic and Joannian authorship of the book. The general trend and tendency in New Testament research at present, in which the principle of tradition is admitted as a more substantial basis for a correct idea of the origin and history of the Biblical books than mere literary analysis, and for which new departure no less a man than Harnack is the protagonist, who, together with Bossuet, Jülicher, and other prominent New Testament specialists admit the general correctness of ecclesiastical tradition from Paul to Irenaeus, — this general trend and tendency has been a pronounced factor in securing for this fourth gospel the recognition of an entire or a substantial apostolic origin. In fact, the aggressive claims in this line have been put forth rather by those who maintain the Joannine authorship, and those who deny are more and more put on the defensive. This aggressiveness appears not only in the newer editions of the works of such veterans as Luthardt and Godet, but especially by the entirely new investigations of such men as Köhler, Paul Ewald, Delff and others, and the common position maintained is this that the gospel of John forms a necessary complement and supplement to the Synoptic records, and that without the former



the latter are incomplete and present an entirely one-sided picture of the doings and sayings of the Lord, and can be properly understood only when read in the light of the deeper and richer presentation of John. This, e. g. Ewald regards as the chief problem in the gospel researches of the times, and Delff declares that if we had no other records of Christ than those in the Synoptic gospels we could just as well close the book of Christianity. This line of thought is not altogether new, it having been developed especially by Beyschlag and the elder Weiss; but the emphasis placed upon it and the use made of it is doubtless the most notable feature in the modern investigations as to the origin and character of the fourth gospel.

---

NOTE.

ONE of the most noteworthy efforts of the Germans to popularize the results of recent Biblical criticism, in so far as this can be done in a good translation, is found in the new version of the New Testament by Pastor Curt Stage, already well known as editor of various collections of sermons from the pens of the most noted representatives of modern theological thought in the Fatherland. The special title is *Das Neue Testament uebersetzt in die Sprache der Gegenwart*, and the book, of 568 pages, appears as one of the famous Reclam Series, the most widely spread popular library published in Germany, the so-called *Universal-Bibliothek*, at the nominal cost of 1.50 marks. What Weizöcker's New Testament aims to do for the theological student by an exact rendering in modern methods of expression of the New Testament writing; this Stage aims to do for the general reader, and it can be said with considerable success. The result of this work is a modern, popular version of the New Testament. Comments are not added, except occasionally an explanatory word or two, as in Matt. 17, 24-27, in which cases however the comments are distinguished by peculiar type. Brief introductions, generally only a page in length, precede the separate books. The text is the critical *textus receptus* of the day, chiefly based on Westcott-Hort, and the translation is based chiefly on the interpretation of the Meyer series of commentaries. The division into verses has not been adopted as interfering with understanding of the run of thought. The language of the version is very often in marked contrast to that of the Luther version.

# MODEL SERMONS. SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, \$2.50; half leather, \$3.00; half morocco, \$4.00;  
Imitation morocco, two volumes, \$4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

By DR. C. H. L. SCHUETTE.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship 'with understanding:' and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, \$1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five. "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## THE MEANS OF GRACE

BY REV. O. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

## Columbus Theological Magazine.

**THIS Magazine** is designed to supply the want of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim is the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all departments is embraced within its scope.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as circumstances permit.

The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers, 35 cents.

All remittances should be addressed to LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, Columbus.

All communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges to GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., Columbus, Ohio.

---

Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28.

## THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

ITS FOUNDATION, ESSENCE, APPEARANCE AND WORK.

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Prompted by the purest motive, the desire to serve his Master by being helpful to fellow-laborers, fully conscious that the unscriptural views on the subject enter the soul and should be exposed, and confident "that the King will accompany it with His blessing," the author wrote and published this work.

This work is notable for its comprehensive and yet simple analysis of its subject, for its earnest devotion to the practical topics and problems that spring out of church life at every point." — *Lutheran Church Review*.

The work is carefully prepared and well written. — *Lutheran Observer*.

The book contains 364 pages and sells for \$1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

No Theological Library Complete Without It.

## THE ERROR OF MODERN MISSOURI:

ITS INCEPTION, DEVELOPMENT, AND REFUTATION,

AS SET FORTH IN

**The Present Controversy on Predestination; A Contribution to its History and Proper Estimate.** By F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.

"*Intuitu Fidel.*" By REV. F. A. SCHMIDT, D. D.

**A Testimony Against the False Doctrine of Predestination Recently Introduced by the Missouri Synod.** By Several Former Members of the Missouri Synod.

EDITED BY GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

The subject matter discussed in these several treatises is vast and varied. Dr. C. Schuette, President of Ev. Luth. Synod, has the following to say with reference to the book: "Suffice it to say that the erudition, assiduity and conscientiousness of authors, and of the translators as well, are the best guarantee any one can ask for the book herewith recommended is a treasury of profound thought, nice reasoning of rich information. May it find its way into the hands of many readers and prove of lasting good to them and through them to the Church at large."

The book contains 800 large octavo pages and sells for \$2.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL  
DEVOTED TO THE INTER-  
ESTS OF THE EVANGEL-  
ICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH

*Edited by the Theological Faculty of Capital University*

VOL. XX      DECEMBER 1900

No. 6

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE SABBATH PRINCIPLE IN OUR CHRISTIAN CHURCH YEAR. By Rev. C. B. Goides, A. M. . . . .	321
THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. Briefly ex- plained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D. . . . .	338
THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM IN THE JOINT SYNOD. By Rev. J. Sheatsley . . . . .	347
ELOCUTION FOR PREACHERS OR PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Rev. E. G. Tressel, A. M. . . . .	358
JUNG STILING — AND RATIONALISM. By Rev. J. C. Schacht, A. B. . . . .	363
PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS OF NEW TESTAMENT RE- SEARCH. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. . . . .	369
NOTES . . . . .	375

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN

55-57-59 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, OHIO

# MODEL SERMONS. FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, \$2.50; half leather, \$3.00; half morocco, \$4.00;  
Imitation morocco, two volumes, \$4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

## BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH  
IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

By DR. C. H. L. SCHUETTE.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship 'with understanding:' and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, \$1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

## CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five. "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

## THE MEANS OF GRACE

By REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

---

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF  
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

---

EDITED BY THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME XX.



COLUMBUS, OHIO:  
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.  
1900.

# INDEX.

## NUMBER 1.

	PAGE
What is the Motive to do Right? By PROF. M. LOY, D. D., Columbus, Ohio .....	1
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN D. D., Columbus, Ohio.....	10
The Significance of the Altar. By REV. W. E. SCHRAMM, Allegheny, Pa .....	24
The Lafayette of the Reformation. By PROF. A. PFLUEGER, A. M., Columbus, Ohio.....	31
Criticism: True and False. Translated by REV. W. E. TRESSEL.	42

## NUMBER 2.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.....	65
How to Secure More Students for Our Colleges. By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.....	74
The School of the Reformation. By REV. R. C. H. LENSKI....	86
Criticism: True and False. Translated by REV. W. E. TRESSEL.	102
Old Testament Chronology in the Light of the Monuments. By REV. G. FINKE.....	114
Funeral Sermons .....	119, 124

## NUMBER 3.

Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M .....	129
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.....	137
Criticism: True and False. Translated by REV. W. E. TRESSEL.	146
Funeral Sermons. Sketch by REV. L. H. BURRY, A. M.....	168
Biblical Finds and Recent Discussions. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D .....	170
The Pastor and His Greek Testament. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D .....	183
The Biblical and Other Deluge Stories.....	189
Notes .....	191

## NUMBER 4.

	PAGE
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.....	193
The Council of Constance. By PROF. E. PFEIFFER, A. M.....	205
Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M.....	224
What Great Men Think of the Bible.....	229
Prisca, the Author of Hebrews.....	254
Notes .....	255

## NUMBER 5.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.....	257
The Central Theological Problem of the Day. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.....	267
Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M.....	274
Pastoral Visitation of the Sick. By REV. WALTER L. SPIEL- MAN, A. B.....	278
Funeral Sermon. By REV. L. H. SCHUH, PH. D.....	286
The Converting Grace of the Holy Spirit and the Transitive Conversion of the Sinner. By REV. PAUL S. L. JOHN- SON, A. B.....	289
Recent Biblical Research. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE PH. D.	312

## NUMBER 6.

The Sabbath Principle in Our Christian Church Year. By REV. C. B. GOHDES, A. M.....	321
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly explained by PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.....	338
The Educational Problem in the Joint Synod. By REV. J. SHEATSLEY .....	347
Elocution for Preachers or Public Speaking. By REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M.....	358
Jung Stilling—And Rationalism. By REV. J. C. SCHACHT, A. B.....	363
Progress and Problems of New Testament Research. By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.....	369
Notes .....	375



# COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

---

Vol. XX.

DECEMBER, 1900.

No. 6.

---

## THE SABBATH PRINCIPLE IN OUR CHRISTIAN CHURCH YEAR.

BY REV. C. B. GOHDES, A. M., SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

A fallen angel has become a devil. The Lord's day, purloined from its rightful master and alienated from its rightful use, has become the devil's day. This name could well be given to our Sunday, in both American and European cities, for in the devil's service this day is spent by thronging multitudes. Experience has shown that a popular attitude of respect toward the day of rest is the best safeguard of public peace and morals, but that the whole filthy brood of vices will follow Sunday desecration as the swine of Gadara their impish guide.

It appears that nowhere is the golden mean so easily abandoned and the truth travestied, as in the celebration of the holy day. The noisy, maudlin Continental Sunday shakes his fist across the channel at his sour-faced Puritan brother. Rarely the community or individual is found who manifests the true Sabbath joy in connection with a conscientious avoidance of everything not in keeping with the spirit of the day. Bismarck setting foot on English soil on the Lord's day is restrained from whistling by his companion, and though far from being hostile to the Christian religion, engages in frank expressions of contempt for Puritan England. John Bull spending a Sunday by the ivygarlanded Rhine feels disturbed in his Sunday rest by the singing, eating and drinking Teutons who write holy day holiday. And with us in the states the Puritan Sunday—surely much the better of the two extremes—has waged a losing fight against the Continental Sunday which has drawn from our free soil strength for truly alarming aggression. Love of pleasure is facile princeps among

causes of Sunday profanation. Greed stands ready to profit by the requirements of pleasure. Rest is interpreted as idleness and idleness fills the places where the fires of intemperance and lust are ~~ever~~ quenched and ever fanned. And while the owner of the railway stocks complacently leans in his cushioned pew, all the hands on the road are put in requisition to handle the extra traffic called forth by glaring advertisements of Sunday excursions.

Why do not people listen to that stern "remember" which introduces the third commandment thus characterizing it as the heart of the decalogue? What infamy, that a man like Hæckel of Jena can have contracted spiritual ophthalmia to such a degree that he replies to the stern "remember" of the great God: "It pleases us to worship in the temple of science," and summons his students to laboratory work on the Lord's day. Deism is practically the religion of the masses and classes. They believe in a God without a strong arm and a loving heart, a God without paternal pity and judicial rigor. Therefore Sinai's thunders do not terrify, Gethsemane's tears do not soften, Calvary's crimson dew does not baptize countless multitudes.

For this deplorable condition no amelioration can be found in legislation. Strict Sunday laws, where they do not represent the wishes of the people at large, lead to circumvention and venality. The legalistic, Puritan doctrine of Sunday will not permanently preserve the Sunday as a day of rest and worship. It brings to bear pressure from without, instead of creating and strengthening the principle of freedom, which is a union of the human with the divine will. The example of evangelical pastors and churches does not infrequently tend to show that their views tend to an abolition of the principle as well as the institution of the Sabbath. In the writer's German native town the pastor would annually make the announcement that the afternoon service would fall away on account of the joint Kinder- and Schuetzenfest. Of a great German poet and preacher—now deceased the writer has been poet and preacher—now deceased—the writer has been creditably informed that he would take his family on bright Sunday afternoons to a resort, which would be called here a beer garden, though the superiority of the German article dare not be questioned. Clearly where lack of piety is ruled out as a manifest cause of a loose Sunday observance, laxity of views is in evidence. The Sabbath has been abolished, the Sabbath principle never.

## I. THE JEWISH SABBATH.

Our Lutheran scholars appear to agree that the observance of the Sabbath was unknown until its institution by Moses as part of an ethical-legal code. They will pardon their disciple for deeming their arguments inconclusive. Should God have failed to reveal to the people that knew Him before Moses, the history of the world including His rest after the completion of His work? When Moses prohibits the gathering of manna on the Lord's day, he speaks of the cause of such inhibition as already known, viz. "This is that which the Lord hath said: 'To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord.'" Even the Assyrians recognized the significance of the Sabbath in dividing the first twenty-eight days of the month into weeks of seven days; each week beginning with a Sabbath, on which work was prohibited. It was also a primitive Delphic custom to dedicate the seventh day to Apollo by issuing oracular messages in his name. To interpret such customs as echoes from the youth of humanity, as reminiscences of the first Sabbath which typified the rest of God's people nascent in time, perfect in eternity, is not an illegitimate stretch of fancy. If the patriarchs had no specific Sabbath day, the Sabbath principle of rest in God found ready culture in their peculiar environment. The contemplative existence of a shepherd was all but a Sabbath life. While the Old Testament contains no proof for or against an observance of a periodical day of rest by the patriarchs, it is not altogether unlikely that they knew and observed such a day.

What the patriarchs possessed at best as a mere germ, bourgeoned into a well-developed system under the Mosaic dispensation. Festival after festival was created to safeguard the people against apostasy to alien gods, to remind them of the past divine favors, to serve as the husks from which in the fullness of time the blessings of the Gospel were to spring forth. Such a time of special celebration was the new moon. The first day of the Sabbatical month was also inaugurated with solemn ceremonies. There were sacrificial festivals when hearts mourning for sin, offered sacrifices whose typical character, a maturer age and completer revelation more strongly emphasized. There were agricultural festivals when festive strains filled the land joying in the blessings which the Lord had laid upon field and vineyard. There were even Sabbatical years when the plow was forbidden to lacerate the soil; when spontaneous

harvests were free to the whole populace and the slave recovered his freedom by mandatory manumission, while the debtor regained control of his property through the cancellation of his debt.

While among us Christians the positive side of Sabbath observance is emphasized, the mode of observance prescribed in the Old Testament was mainly prohibitory. Work was absolutely confined to acts of necessity and emergency, or incidental to worship. Even the kindling of a fire was forbidden as unlawful. Nor were the penalties inflicted upon the transgressor less rigorous than the enactment. Death was visited upon the offender as a warning to his contemporaries, as a hint to coming ages that he who ignores the principle of the Sabbath invites death, spiritual, if not physical.

The purpose of the Jewish Sabbath and the numerous festivals which partook of its nature to a greater or less degree, can be summed up in one word: rest. Physical rest by mandatory abstention from labor, spiritual rest by attendance upon worship. The latter was rendered possible only by the interruption of secular labor. This rest was extended in the Sabbatical years to the very soil, to which man owed his sustenance and to the slaves made restive by their alien condition. Such Sabbath rest was broadened and deepened by the offering of sacrifices and by the hearing of God's Word, to which the teachers of the people invited by expounding the law in synagogue and temple. But after all, the Sabbath of the Old Testament could supply rest for the soul only by reflection and anticipation, not by actual possession. Man's soul, restless as the moon-stirred sea apart from its Creator, requires divine fellowship as irremissible condition of rest. The children of God in the Old Testament might celebrate His Sabbath in remembrance of paradise where God rested after calling forth the universe out of the infinite emptiness. They might look forward to the new paradise, but, as many subjective utterances of prophets and psalmists show, there was little of that victorious repose characteristic of the disciple of Christ in view of death, because there was no intimate knowledge of Him who was to be death's conqueror. The people could celebrate the Sabbath as a memorial of liberation from the shameful bondage of Egypt, but that freedom from the curse and dominion of sin which we enjoy under the dispensation of the Spirit, they could only desire as a promised boon, as the sacrifices reminded them of an atonement to be wrought out through a Savior's blood.

This hope alone could produce that rest which the minute details of the law wantonly multiplied by tyrannous elders rendered impossible.

That the Sabbath was no final institution becomes evident when we reflect that its point of gravity rested in the past. A paradise lost, a usurper humbled and slain, a law which condemned but could not save and comfort; such reminiscences formed the perspective of the Old Testament celebrant.

## II. THE SABBATH AS AN INSTITUTION IS ABOLISHED.

It is a singular phenomenon on the field of symbolics, that what was clearly a temporary adjunct of the moral law and a part of the ceremonial law in its marking of specific days as sacred, has been continued as still being in force by the larger part of the Protestant church. Sunday is considered as the Sabbath of the Christian church. The modifications in the observance of the holy day are slight, but clearly inexcusable, if the premises of the Reformed party are granted. Of all non-Lutheran communions the Seventh day Adventists are the only ones strictly consistent in repudiating the change of day as old as the Christian church. The legalistic attitude of the numerous Protestant bodies becomes painfully apparent when we view their anxious, fruitless and bootless efforts against the introduction of our great festivals and their antiquated nomenclature in calling the Lord's day Sabbath.

The words of Christ have neither meaning nor force, if our Lutheran deduction that the Sabbath has been abolished as an institution is erroneous. Freedom from law is one of the choicest blessings of the gospel. The Messianic time has come when the worship of the Lord is performed in the spirit and in truth. The props of the ceremonial law have fallen where inward strength is offered by the Holy Ghost, and the moral law has ceased to be law in the case of a believer whose soul, emancipated from the flesh, seeks in its newly-found liberty its own enlargement. In him who has been made free by the Son, the heart impelled by the inner life, seeks of its own initiative what the law demands. The moral law is the channel in which the Christian moves from free choice. The fixing of one day in preference to others is a feature of the law in its ceremonial aspect. Proceeding from correct definitions of Gospel and evangelical liberty a mere "a posteriore" proof would be sufficient to secure the total collapse of the theory that

the Sunday is the Old Testament Sabbath in its evangelical and universal transformation. But the evidence for our Lutheran position is not found in dialectics and its weapons but in an exegesis of the *sedes doctrinæ*. St. Paul, than whom no one has more scrupulously championed the cause of Christian liberty and declaimed against its abuses, who in the exercise of Christian liberty conformed repeatedly to Old Testament usages which, with the advent of the Gospel, had ceased to be binding, solemnly warns against the observance of any and all Old Testament practices from the standpoint of legal and moral requirement. And the observance of fixed days he regards as equally hostile to our liberty in Christ and the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith with the perpetuation of the sumptuary laws of the Old Testament. The Galatians he warns: "Ye observe days and months and seasons and years: I am afraid of you, lest, by any means, I have bestowed labor on you in vain." Legalistic conformity to the requirements of the Mosaic code he condemns as wilful bondage under the rudiments or elements of the world. To the world then, not to the kingdom of God belongs the maintenance of the preparatory forms of Old Testament religion. They are dead works, not fruits of faith. And the Sabbath as an institution is evidently included in the passage above quoted: If the years here mentioned cannot be but the Sabbatical years which brought rest to the soil and its hitherto unrequited toiler, if the month mentioned is evidently the Sabbatical month, so-called because it was the seventh month in the year and characterized by eminent festivals, if the seasons are the festivals which continued for several successive days and every other explanation is forced—the days cannot be anything else but the Sabbath days. These holy days are abrogated. The Sabbath principle of rest in God endures. Holy time is still to be observed for the purpose of thanking the Lord for His past goodness and of looking forward to the time when the rest in God shall cease to be harassed and diminished by foes. However the principle of holy time can not find evangelical expression in an advocacy of a legal enactment as to days and feasts. The Sabbath principle of rest in God requires days for its maintenance and proper recognition, but such days must be suggested by a liberty which to be true to itself, must first have cut loose from all trammels formerly imposed by the law. This the Galatians had failed to do, and our modern Puritans are equally inconsistent. Such is the unequivocal teaching of Paul. Such

is also that of Christ. As the Lord of the Sabbath who had inaugurated the Sabbath principle of rest in paradise and who originated the transient expression of this principle under the law by setting apart certain days, he revokes the Sabbath as an institution. His clear and emphatic words and his reproof of the censorious Pharisees mean more than a repudiation of the arbitrary ordinances of the elders which were not conducive but rather inimical to true rest. They mean more than a mere progress from the negative feature of abstinence from labor to the positive feature of worship and active benevolence. They cannot utter cessation of the Sabbath as an institution. If our sectarian friends maintain that our Sunday is the Sabbath changed from Saturday to the first day of the week, what right have they to eliminate the legal features of the Sabbath? If Christ had not freed us from Sabbath as such, He has not freed us from prohibition to build fires on that day. In that case everything which does not come under the head of absolute necessity and emergency remains to trouble the Christian conscience, to confuse the Christian mind and to obscure a Gospel which spells liberty. Or did Paul misrepresent the lordship of Christ over the Sabbath when he wrote to the Colossians: "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of the things to come but the body is Christ's"? As in a previously quoted passage the several festivals singled out from secular time are here again mentioned. The Sabbath days are the regular Sabbaths of the Old Testament. If in the translation the singular number were found, it would be more strictly true to the meaning of the text. The contention that no single days such as the regular Sabbath, can be meant is supported only by ignorance, not knowledge of New Testament Greek. In Matt. 12, 1, where Christ is related as having gone through the cornfields, on the Sabbath day, only one specific day, not a series of days can be meant. Yet the plural number is used: *tois sabbasin*. The plural is again used in Luke 4, where Christ is related as going into Nazareth and visiting the synagogue situated at that place. What is now the evident meaning of Paul? He clearly demonstrates the repeal of the summary laws of the Old Testament. "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink." No one will deny that henceforth temperance and neighborly love are the only barriers to an unrestrained use of the food and drink which the earth pro-

duces. That much also the vision of Peter demonstrates besides the eligibility of the Gentiles to membership in the Christian Church. But according to Paul, holy days, feast days and Sabbath days belong to the same category of abrogated usages as the meats and drinks the use of which had been forbidden by the Mosaic law. The regulations relative to the ones as well as the others obtain no longer since the era of Evangelical liberty has been ushered in. Fixed days are indeed kept holy. Holy time has never been unknown in the Christian Church. Proselytes from Judaism continued in the early age to observe the old Sabbaths and other days which had become dear to them by sacred tradition and life-long association. They even looked askance at the Gentile Christians who passed over into the Canaan of Christian liberty without the servile apprenticeship necessary before the new era of liberty and truth. Paul, indeed, recognized their right to give preference in their selection of holy time to the days and festivals of their fathers, but he insisted upon the right of others to disregard those days, and pronounced as dangerous the doctrine that the celebration of these days as such was a part of moral obligation. Paul's contention receives added weight from his placing the festivals of the Old Testament once more upon the same level with the abrogated sumptuary laws. Rom. 14 we read: "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth all days alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he does not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." The conclusion is inevitable that the continued celebration of the Sabbath as a legal requirement has its source in the same misconception as the adherence to obsolete sumptuary laws. According to Paul the disciple's relation to God is in no wise affected by his regard or disregard of any and all days which constituted holy time under the old dispensation, excepting when he regarded them as obligatory from the standpoint of the law. In that case it was a return to the rudiments of the world.

The Lutheran Church, therefore, considers the third commandment, as far as it involves the setting apart of a specific day, as a part of the ceremonial law, but as an eternally binding part of the moral law the Sabbath principle of rest in the Lord. Our great defender of evangelical



liberty, Martin Luther, has therefore taken no liberty with the sacred text by translating it: "Gedenke des Feiertages, dass du ihn heiligest." There is no reason to tone down, in the very least, the declaration of the Augustana (Art. 28). "Such is the observation of the Lord's day, of Easter, of Pentecost, and like holidays and rites. For they that think that the observation of the Lord's day was appointed by the authority of the Church, instead of the Sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived. The Scripture which teacheth that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the church did for that purpose appoint the Lord's day, which for this cause also seems to have been pleasing, that they might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observance neither of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, was of necessity." (Jacobs).

Notwithstanding the abrogation of the Sabbath the observation of holy time is characteristic of the Lutheran Church as it was of the early Christians. Holy time is the very garment formed and filled out by Christian liberty, the very longing of the regenerated heart. For the Sabbath principle has not been abrogated, nor can it be. It corresponds with human nature in its deepest necessities. Rest in the Lord is the eternal Sabbath principle which Jehovah's rest in paradise rayed forth upon a world embowered in beauty, which the patriarchs observed in the repose of their shepherd life while they walked with God, which crystallized in the law and became the heirloom of the chosen people when idolatry waxed triumphant in the world. This principle the intelligent Christian and the Church at large will uphold by the inauguration and maintenance of holy time, and it will come to its undisputed right when the Saints of God have attained to their eternal rest.

Rest in God postulates periodical freedom from exertion. There must be a time, therefore, when physical labor ceases, so that the soul may be unfettered in its struggles to rest in God. There must be a time when the desire of the mind or body for diversion should not be gratified, in order that the soul may indulge in the higher pleasures which the contemplation of divine love affords. According to the eternal Sabbath principle time is divided into days when earthly duties are paramount though never ex-

clusive of spiritual duties and joys, and days when the latter are paramount while the former are repressed to a minimum. On the other hand rest in the Lord, conditioned and embodied in holy time, postulates and requires labor. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work." The idler can not appreciate and utilize such holy time as the institutions of the Christian Church afford. When labor is no longer required by necessity, altruism and the public weal afford plenty of opportunity to the man of parts to use all the time not required by the soul and its Creator.

The reflex influence of holy time upon that which remains secular is the consecration of all time. The radiance of holy time devoutly observed will fall upon all the week. While the Sabbath principle of rest is eternally binding upon all mankind, in as far as it knows the Lord, there is no doubt that the same principle as enunciated in Scripture, determines the proportion of time which is to be taken out of the sphere of secular occupation. God gave one day out of seven of old. One day out of seven was chosen not because of cabalistic prejudice in favor of the number seven, but because man was built upon the seventh day plan. Just as the Creator wisely and minutely proportioned the amount of water to that of land in order that the earth should be neither a swamp nor a desert, so He regulated the proportion of holy time. And if this theory should seem to lack cogency of evidence, the fact remains that Christendom would deem its dearest interests at stake, should the seventh day principle be disregarded in the appointment of holy time. When the leaders of the French revolution appointed the tenth day as that of rest, the act was understood and obeyed — and doomed to evanescent force as an assault upon time-honored principles of the kingdom of God.

Rest in God, this eternal Sabbath principle, however, is permanently impossible without attendance upon divine worship, with the preaching of the Gospel as its center. The assurance of divine forgiveness, the begetting and strengthening of that which grasps it, viz., faith, the stimulation of the new life in God, are the factors which condition rest in God. Thus the proclamation of the Gospel becomes the most essential feature of holy time. The abrogation of the sacred days and seasons of the Old Testament confronting the Christian Church, the problem was to be solved of establishing holy time in the exercise of Christian liberty. The factors given were the preaching of the Gospel

and man's permanent need of hearing the Gospel at regular intervals. The adequate solution of the problem is the Christian Church Year with its Sundays and festivals.

### III. THE RATIONALE OF THE CHURCH YEAR.

The origin of the Sunday as the day of rest has given rise to not a little discussion. To be distinguished from the Jews has been assigned as the chief purpose in the selection of Sunday as holy time. Such explanation confounds the result with the motive. The institution of Sunday observance is not the fruit of concerted action on the part of the early Christian Church, it is rather the final expression of the genius of Christianity over against that of Judaism after the prevalence of divergent principles and practices. The proselytes from Judaism wherever gathered in congregations, continued observing the Sabbath, not as mandatory from the standpoint of the law, but as an appropriate expedient of embodying, in the manner most natural for them, the external Sabbath principle of rest in God. The iconoclastic legalistic spirit of later sects and ages was foreign to St. Paul. Far from finding merit or intrinsic value in circumcision, he yet circumcised Timothy in order to make him acceptable to Jewish Christians of weak faith. Though totally emancipated from the forms of Jewish life as means of membership in the kingdom of God, he observed these forms, whenever it served his purpose. Thus he shore his head at Cenchrea. He even offered a sacrifice in the temple after observing the ordinance respecting purification, though no one felt more acutely than he that all such sacrifices had found in Jesus their fulfillment and logical termination. But wherever the newly-found life in Christ turned spontaneously to the old forms, he honored the conservatism that prompted such a choice. Therefore he found no fault with the continued observance of the Sabbath, and, on the other hand, he placed no hindrance in the way of those who, without hereditary predilection, sought a new channel for the expression and gratification of their need of rest in God. He was satisfied to secure mutual recognition and to see the life of believers in Christ, for which external forms are only means and channels. To this liberal policy of Paul the Christian Church is indebted for unity being attained in the matter of Sunday observance without clashing. In Corinth, in Galatia, in Asia Minor Sunday became the Lord's day. On that day apostles conducted religious worship and benevolent contributions were received. And

as the Jewish element gradually lost its identity in the Christian congregation the Lord's day became the universal holiday of Christendom. After a period of celebrating both days, we find that the congregation in Jerusalem was a unit in Sunday observance already A. D. 200 (Jahn.) This salutary result was reached by a careful fencing in of Gentile territory against the customs of the Old Testament and Judaizing teachers, and by a liberal and truly evangelical treatment of the Jewish Christians, for whom it was natural to continue the new life in the old forms. Far from being an affront upon and sign of proposed separation from the Jews, the Sunday developed as the inevitable corollary of Christian life. The Lord's day does not gaze backward as the obsolete Sabbath, but forward. It is rooted in the resurrection of Christ, and we look forward to our resurrection in Christ. On a Sunday the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the Christian Church. We look forward to the time when the Holy Spirit shall inform and transfigure our whole being. On a Sunday the Christian Church was founded, and Christians look forward to the time when in the Church Triumphant everything shall be eliminated that now troubles and separates her members. This jubilant triumphant note is characteristic of the Sunday as being commemorative of the resurrection of Christ. This act of God was the burst of light which transfigured the man of sorrows into the captain of our salvation. It is the thunderous Amen of heaven to all that Christ has said and done. It conquered the last lingering doubts in the hearts of those convinced of its objective character and enabled them to do and die for Him who was dead but is living for evermore. Given the fact of the resurrection of Christ and its effect upon a community controlled by the Holy Spirit and the inauguration of Sunday as holy time in perpetuity was a foregone conclusion. The Gentile Christians hailed the day as a treasure trove of heavenly rest and after a brief period of hesitation it was adopted even by those of Jewish blood as an appropriate channel and safeguard of that rest which is heaven's choicest gift to the denizens of a restless world.

The genesis and rationale of the Sunday is the key to the Church Year. Lutherans are often amused and mortified by the disregard for our festivals on the part of sectarians and their denunciation of the same as evidences of popish and Old Testament domination. If the parties to this indictment could be reversed, the indictment could be made true. Believing Sunday to be the Old Testament Sabbath in its universal transformation, the sects prize the

Sunday as of intrinsic superiority to other days, and, finding no warrant in the New Testament for special festivals, they are foreigners to a mode of worship which is not dependent upon individual ingenuity for variety and climacteric interest. The festivals of the Church Year have their origin in precisely the same soil as the Christian Sunday, viz., Christian liberty, which is the product of the Holy Spirit no less than its counterpart, obedience. There have been events in the kingdom of God, acts of God transcending all others in importance for our salvation. They are the birth of Christ, His crucifixion, resurrection, ascension and the mission of the Holy Ghost. In setting apart special days for the consideration of these basal truths and facts, and in ordering the remaining Sundays with a view to climacteric effect, the Church Year, just like the seasons of a secular year, is always productive of interest and edification for the intelligent and devout Christian. The Church Year in vogue in our Church is not a perpetuation of Old Testament principles, as charged. It is the crystallization of holy time brought about by spiritual need intelligently interpreted. As the vitality of the Jewish Church recruited itself largely from the compulsory yet freely observed measures of attendance upon the great festivals, so we fear, our distinctive native Lutheran vitality will have been supplanted by legalistic, Puritan forms of life, should the great festivals of our Church Year, after their present conquering attitude, ever be doomed to obsolescence. While sectarians are intent upon producing artificial revival seasons, as though man could dictate to the Spirit when to do His reviving work, the seasons of a natural revival come in our Church in regular order, whenever in rotation the successive acts of divine love are held up for Christian adoration. Eternal love in its environment of poverty in Bethlehem, unfolding its passion flowers to awful bloom on Calvary, rising triumphant from the death inflicted by retributive justice, sending its life and power through the Comforter, such love portrayed in regular seasons will relieve the remaining Sundays from the appearance of sameness and flatness. The Church Year wisely ordered and intelligently and devoutly observed, will stimulate the Christian consciousness and quicken the life which weeps in repentance, breathes in prayer, works in love.

The Church Year is so arranged, as to bring before the people of God, in an orderly development, the acts of God for our salvation, and to accomplish as the subjective counterpart of these objective verities the several stages of spir-

itual experience from the first advent dawn of repentance to the mature life of Christ. Rest in God is the eternal Sabbath principle. The Christian Church Year with its Sundays and festivals is the response which the Church has made in its attempt at adequately recognizing this principle.

#### IV. THE OBSERVANCE OF HOLY TIME IS NECESSARY TO THE WELL-BEING OF BOTH CHURCH AND STATE.

Not only the Church but also the State is interested in the observance of stated periods of rest. The State being the institute of rights, the material well-being of its citizens is the peculiar burden of the State. While the scope of the rest ordained by the State will naturally not embrace that covered by the rest which the Church provides, it is the duty of the State to provide a day of rest when the din of labor ceases and the higher nature of man can be cultivated. The day of rest ordained by the State coinciding with the Lord's day of the Christian Church, Christians will refrain from quibbling interpretations of the laws of their respective states and do all in their power to secure recognition and obedience for the Sunday laws as well as others. It will readily be conceded that the most virtuous and orderly communities are those, in which the regular days of rest are faithfully observed and that our so-called open cities are hotbeds of vice. Not for the purpose of promoting religion but of safeguarding its own existence and the temporal and moral well-being of its citizens, is the State constrained to enact Sunday laws. Liberty and the pursuit of happiness are a solemn charge resting upon the State. These prerogatives of citizenship are inhibited from free operation when greed is permitted to ignore the day of rest and the great moral truth that man has been built upon the seventh day plan. The moral life of a people is vitiated when rest at the specific interval of seven days is denied to a considerable proportion of its members. No State has a right to let its legislatures turn the cold shoulder to the interests of its Christian constituency. When the social fabric has become so materialistic that Christians are robbed of the privilege of enjoying their day of rest and worship, and others are rendered inaccessible to spiritual influences the soil is prepared for an upheaval which will affect those very interests demanding exclusive attention from the worshippers of mammon. Such principles as these are not foreign to common law. Blackstone says: "Beside the

indecent and scandal of permitting any regular business to be transacted on that day by a country professing Christianity, and the corruption of morals which usually follows its profanation, the keeping of this day holy as a time of relaxation, as well as for public worship, is of admirable service to the State considered merely as a public institution. It humanizes by the help of conversation and society, the manners of the lower classes which would otherwise degenerate into a wild ferocity and savage selfishness of spirit; it enables the industrious workman to pursue his occupation during the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness; it imprints upon the minds of the people that sense of their duty toward God, so necessary to make them good citizens, but which would be defaced by an unremitted continuance of labor, without any stated time to recall them to their Maker." In the best regulated communities the limits of liberty drawn by the State will be much wider than those of Christian liberty, which are drawn with due regard to the necessity of worship, but always and everywhere will Christian liberty be found within the bounds of law not subversive of itself. The Christian citizen will exert his influence toward the enactment and enforcement of laws which, like concentric circles, are designed to cover more and more territory now occupied by vice and greed. Entirely too many occupations are permitted on Sunday which can not be justified by emergency and necessity. Not a few laborers sigh for laws which will restore to them what their very constitution as moral beings requires, a seventh day of rest. It is the duty of Christians as intelligent citizens jealously to guard against the repeal, courageously to assist in the enforcement, of beneficent Sunday laws.

The chief object of observing holy time, however, is to maintain that liberty which craves and lives in the worship of its donor. It is strange that the principle of Christian liberty is invoked so generally to justify indifference to the third commandment. What is Christian liberty? Freedom from the power of the flesh, so that the regenerated heart of its own choice seeks to do what the Lord requires. Of free choice the Christian moves in spheres of purity and truth according to the sixth and eighth commandment respectively, as well as in the sphere of holy time. Just as the Word preached in walls of brick and mortar turns those walls into a sacred edifice, so the Word of God turns an ordinary day into holy time. A Christian will take no more liberty with holy time than Christ has done.

The principles underlying the structure of the Church

Year suggest a celebration of holy time quite at variance with that of the Puritans. The third commandment is based upon man's need of rest for body and soul. The latter being paramount, a mere external observance of rest on Sunday does not satisfy the needs of the evangelical Christian. Dearer, more solemn and freighted with more transcendent blessings than the ordinary Sunday, is to him the periodical festival that punctuates the Church year. The relation of our holy days to the Sunday is not vastly different from that of the Jewish festivals to the Sabbath. Good Friday, Easter, etc., are of more importance to us than even the Sunday. This attitude characterizes the evangelical character of our Church over against Puritanism. In a country, in which Lutheran traditions have had little influence upon the creation of legal holidays, the exigencies of business threaten to effect a gradual elimination of such holy days as do not fall upon a Sunday. That Lutherans should conquer conditions so inimical to their conception of holy time, is a foregone conclusion.

While it redounds not a little to the honor of our Church that her great festivals have impressed with a sense of their aptness other communions, there is cause for complaint among us about the secularization of the Sunday. We should be so much more conscientious in our use of Christian liberty, as we rightly protest against legalism in the several Protestant bodies which are not Lutheran. It is not evangelical, to be sure, to insist upon the whole of the day being used for an almost incessant worship. Such spirit would make this day once more an adjunct of the law. Just as there comes a time when even legitimate physical or aesthetic pleasures bring about a surfeit, so a practically compulsory attendance upon three or four services on Sunday and the reading of books of devotion in the interval, might in many cases lead to revolt. It is sufficient to call attention to the deep need of the soul which only God's Word can supply; the degree in which the supply is sought will be regulated by the receptivity and capacity of the individual. Unevangelical it would be also to interpret every attempt at recreation and social intercourse as alien to the spirit of the Lord's day. The secular side of life requires recognition on the part of thousands of hard-working men and women. All recreation, be it physical or aesthetic, cannot be regarded as Sunday profanation, as long as it does not contradict the spirit of the day. God's Word being enthroned and recognized as chief claim-



ant of man's homage, all unnecessary labor being excluded, Christian consciousness will find aids to worship even in things which, in themselves, are not spiritual. A spirit of buoyant idealism, of restful peace will be manifest throughout the Lord's day among those who seek to walk with God, and the very diversions which this day makes possible will promote the sense of worship wherever evil and its appearance are avoided.

The question what is and what is not a legitimate occupation on the Lord's day, will have little vexation for one who seeks to imitate the works of charity which appear to be a particular feature of Sabbath observance on the part of the Master. Rest is not synonymous with idleness. A mere change of occupation has been found to be the favorite and most wholesome rest of our greatest minds. Visits to the helpless and lonely, the poor, the sick, the backslidden, the sufferers of any or many of the ills in the vast gamut of human grief, sympathetic identification with their misfortunes and adequate attempts at relief will secure sweeter sensations of gratification than mere diversions which, however innocent, are often only expressions of egoism. Rest brought to others will rebound with added power upon the giver.

Weary and faint Christ one day sank down by a well. His disciples went to the neighboring village for bread. Coming back they found the Master's weariness all gone and all His powers alert. Astonished they asked: "Has any man given Him bread?" Hungry and sore and weary of heart and limb He had sought repose. A heathen woman came and received of Him truth and grace. The sweet knowledge that a soul was comforted and won enabled Him to exert Himself anew. The deed of love sent strength thrilling through every nerve and fiber of the Son of Man, as mere physical rest and diversion could never have done.

Just so the restful hour in the house of God, the quiet performance of some charity in the Spirit of Christ, the tender intercourse with the family will produce such rest for body, mind and soul, as the devotee of Sunday labor and Sunday pleasure will never know.

## THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D.D.,  
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

## CHAPTER XVI.

## C. Commendation of Phoebe: Vv. 1. 2.

Their common Christian sister whom Paul commends to his readers has from olden times been regarded as the bearer of this letter. She is the first deaconess of whom we read, her office being to care for the poor, sick, and strangers in the congregation, especially those of her own sex (comp. Acts 6, 1 sqq.). In this capacity she served the Church at Cenchrea, the eastern harbor of Corinth (1). The Romans were to receive and treat her as a Christian ought to be received and treated by fellow-Christians, and to assist her in every way in the business, perhaps legal, that she had at Rome, then the capital of the world; and this they were to do not only because she was a fellow-Christian and a deaconess in general, but also because in her position she had proved herself the friendly helper of many, and also of Paul himself, perhaps nursing him once when sick (2).

V. 1. *Συνίστημι*: place or bring together, introduce, commend, recommend. Two reasons are here given for recommending her: first, her being a fellow-Christian of both Paul and the Romans, secondly, her being a deaconess; the latter is emphasized by the participle, *οὕσαν*: being, as she is. *Διάκονος* here feminine; the expression *διακόνισσα* is of later origin, being coined as a technical term to denote just this class of female servants or helpers.

V. 2. *ἵνα*: in order that; the purpose of the recommendation is stated. *Ἐν κυρίῳ*: the reception is to be not simply one of common politeness or kindness, but rather one that has its cause and motive in both parties' intimate communion with Christ, in whom every Christian as such lives, moves, and has his being. *Ἀξίως τ. ἁ.*: in a manner worthy of the saints—as Christians ought to receive their fellow-Christians. "Saints": comp. 12, 13. *Παραστήτε*: stand by her. *Ἐν ᾧ . . . πράγματι*=*ἐν τῷ πράγματι ἐν ᾧ*: in the business in which soever (*ᾧ*)=in whatever business (she may have need of you); this expression is made emphatic by being divided. *Καὶ γὰρ αὐτή*: for also she (herself). *Προστάτις*: one who stands before and protects: a female defender, guardian, helper; a more honorable, official term than *παραστάτις*. *Ἐγνήθη*: has proved herself. *Καί*: and also (of me myself).

Greetings sent by Paul himself: Vv. 3-16.

The many greetings Paul sends to Rome, a city where he never had been, show the vivid intercourse that took place between the capital and the different parts of the empire, as also the interest the Apostle took in the congregation at Rome and its individual members. First of all he sends his greetings to his old Christian fellow-workers, Prisca and Aquila (3), both of whom in their love for him and his work had gone so far as even, at some occasion not known to us, to offer their lives for his, and to whom consequently not only Paul himself felt under great obligations but all the churches of heathen Christians whose special apostle Paul was (4). Together with them those Christians are greeted that were wont to assemble in their house for worship. Of the others that are greeted Epāne-

V. 3. Ἀσπάζομαι: to draw to oneself, embrace, salute, greet. Πρίσκα: an abbreviation for Πρίσκιλλα. Also here, as 2 Tim. 4, 19, the tried Christian couple, Priscilla and Aquila, are greeted first. "Since Paul at Corinth had lodged with them they changed and chose their dwelling-place so as to assist him in his calling, as also they had gathered a house-congregation around themselves at Ephesus and later at Rome" (v. Hofmann). Comp. Acts 18, 2. 18 sq. 26; 1 Cor. 16, 19. What had brought them back to Rome we do not know; perhaps v. Hofmann is right in supposing that being initiated in the plans of Paul they had preceded him to Rome to prepare him a lodging there as formerly at Ephesus. Here, as 2 Tim. 4, 19 and Acts 18, 18. 26, the wife is mentioned first, probably because she was the more gifted and energetic; the only real exception to this order is 1 Cor. 16, 19, since in Acts 18, 2 it is a matter of course that the husband is given the first place. "My fellow-workers in Christ Jesus": they worked together not simply in tent-making (Acts 18, 3) but also in that work that is done in life-communion with Christ and for His cause, i. e., they were Christian co-laborers, working for the spreading of the Gospel and kingdom of Christ. "Christ Jesus": the Messiah that has come in Jesus of Nazareth.

V. 4. Ὁὔτινες: such persons as=since they—a special reason why they are given such prominence. "For my life (or, soul) laid down their own necks", namely, under the executioner's ax. Whether this is to be taken literally, that is, as speaking of a time when they actually offered to give their life for Paul's but somehow were delivered, or figuratively, as referring to some other act of extreme self-devotion and self-sacrifice, we do not know; as a rule the latter alternative is accepted by commentators. That a

tus was the first heathen that in western Asia Minor came to believe in Christ (5). Mary, according to her name a Jewish Christian, had at some former time of need greatly exerted herself in the service of the Romans (6). Andronicus and Junias, or perhaps Junia, a woman, were either Paul's relatives in the stricter sense, or Jews by descent (comp. 9, 3), who at some time had been imprisoned together with him; moreover, they were highly esteemed even by the apostles and had been converted to Christ before Paul (7). Ampliatus was a beloved fellow-Christian (8); Ur-

certain, definite act is meant, and not the general attitude, seems to be clear from the use of the aorist (*ὑπέσκησαν*), not the imperfect or the present tense. The readers of this epistle doubtless knew what was meant. To "all the churches of the Gentiles" also the Roman congregations belonged.

V. 5. "And the church in their house": in larger congregations, scattered perhaps over an extensive territory, it was natural that portions of it would also gather in a convenient place near them, as a rule the house of a prominent member, so as to be able to make a more frequent use of the means of grace. This, of course, did not interfere with the services of the congregation at large, was nothing separatistic. Comp. 1 Cor. 16, 19; Col. 4, 15; Philemon 2. The supposition of *v. Hofmann* that all the persons mentioned after this up to verse 13 were members of that house-congregation is rendered improbable by the continual repetition of the expression "salute" which would seem to indicate that the persons introduced by it were distinct from that house-congregation. Of all the persons mentioned till verse 15 we know nothing definite, except what is stated here, with the possible exception of Rufus in verse 13. Patristic legends made most of them bishops and martyrs, and in one of them the majority is stated to have belonged to the seventy disciples (Luke 10, 1). *Ἀπαρχή*: first-fruit sacrificed to God; here used figuratively of the one first converted. Asia is here the Roman province of Asia, including the western provinces of Asia Minor, bordering on the sea (comp. Acts 2, 9; 6, 9). Since this was a heathen country, Epænetus beyond doubt was a Gentile Christian. *Εἰς Χριστόν*: with regard to Christ, as far as relation to Christ, embracing Christianity, is concerned.

V. 6. *Ἡτις κατλ.*: who is such a person as=because she has toiled much with reference to you, or, for you.

V. 7. *Ἰουλίαν*: the accusative of *Ἰουλία*, which would be a feminine noun; the true reading may however be *Ἰουνιᾶν*, from—*ᾱς*, a masculine noun. If the former is the case the woman

banus, a Christian fellow-worker of Paul and his readers, carrying on, perhaps, missionary work at Rome; Stachys, a beloved friend (9). Apelles was a specially tried and approved Christian. Those that were of the household of Aristobulus no doubt were servants or slaves that had become believers in Christ (10). The same holds good with regard to those Christians that belonged to the household of Narcissus, who by some is supposed to have been the influential freedman of the emperor Claudius mentioned by

may be the wife or sister of Andronicus; but the latter assumption seems better to fit the description that follows. Συγγενεῖς here probably means relatives in the usual sense, since also Prisca and Aquila, Mary, and no doubt some others mentioned here, besides Herodion (verse 11; comp. verse 21), were Jews by descent, and no reason could be given why only in these cases that should be emphasized. Ὅτινες: comp. vv. 4 and 6. Ἐπίσημοι: persons of note, distinguished, highly respected. "Among the apostles": this may grammatically mean "belonging to the class of apostles"; but this appellation given to such men would be used in so wide a sense as nowhere else in the New Testament, and therefore it is better to understand that expression as meaning "by the apostles": even the apostles held them in great honor. "Who also": another distinguishing feature. "Have become (=have come to be) in Christ": have come to be in communion with Christ, have become Christians (not apostles).

V. 8. Ἀμφίλιτον: others accentuate—ἀτον; still others read Ἀμφιλίαν. "My beloved one in the Lord": whom I love as one who is together with me in intimate communion with Christ, i. e., as my fellow-Christian.

V. 9. "Our fellow-worker": namely, of Paul and the Romans, since Paul, when referring to himself only, in this chapter always uses the singular, "my" (comp. vv. 3, 5, 8, 21). Urbanus may have been a stranger who had come to Rome assisting the Church there in spreading the Gospel and thus also working in the same sphere as Paul. "In Christ": comp. verse 3.

V. 10. "Apelles" certainly was not identical with Paul's well-known collaborer Apollos (Acts 18, 24; 1 Cor. 1, 12; 3, 4 sq.), as some has supposed. He was tried, tested, and approved (δόκιμος) in his communion with Christ, or as a Christian. "Those of those of Aristobulus": those that are of the number of those that belong to A.=those Christians that belong to the household of A. The latter either was not himself a Christian or had already died; else he would also have been mentioned, very likely in the first place.

profane historians (11). The three women mentioned next were perhaps deaconesses, the first and second still then exerting themselves in the service of the Lord and His Church, whilst the third had done so in a special sense in the past (12). Rufus, the eminent Christian, is considered to be one of the two sons of Simon the Cyrenian who carried the cross for Jesus (comp. Mark 15, 21); his mother must at some time have shown Paul special kindness (13). The two groups mentioned then probably were Christians that used to assemble together for worship in a private house (14 sq.; comp. 5). After these greetings by name had been read as a manifestation of Christian fellowship and brotherly love, the readers were to express this same fellowship and love among themselves by the sign customary with the lively

V. 11. "My kinsman", or, relative; comp. verse 7. *Τὸν δὲ ἐκ τῶν κτλ.*: comp. preceding verse. Here the apostle adds what there is understood, "that are in the Lord" = that are in life-communion with Christ, are Christians. Narcissus by some is supposed to be the influential freedman of emperor Claudius mentioned by Tacitus and Suetonius; but according to a statement of the former it seems he was already dead at that time.

V. 12. Tryphæna and Tryphosa both have names derived from the verb *τροφᾶω*, to live in luxury and pleasure. But they were at that time "toiling in the Lord" (part. pres.), showing that their Christian lives did not correspond with their heathen names. Persis is distinguished from the others by being called "the beloved" as well as by the statement that she was such a person (*ἡτις*) as had (in the past) toiled much in the Lord, that is, in her communion with Christ, in His service and that of His believers.

V. 13. "The elect in the Lord": this cannot here mean what may be predicated of every true Christian, namely, who in communion with Christ is elected unto salvation; for the apostle here always adds to a name something that distinguishes the bearer and especially commends him. It must denote one who is distinguished and eminent in his relation to Christ, or, as a Christian. Comp. 1 Pet. 2, 4. "His mother and mine": the mother of Rufus had proved herself a mother also to Paul.

V. 14. Hermas cannot be, as was supposed by Origen already, the author of the celebrated work "Pastor Hermæ", since this evidently was composed in the second century.

V. 15. Julia seems to have been the wife of Philologus. "Saints": comp. 12, 13.

orientals, especially the Jews, the kiss, which here is called holy because it was intended to express holy, Christian love and communion. Lastly Paul sends greetings from all the Christian churches, all those who knew of his writing to Rome having asked him to do so, whilst the others rightly could be supposed to be of the same mind (16).

*E. Warning against False Teachers: Vv. 17-20.*

As the Judaistic teachers that tried more or less to turn the Christians away from Christ and His merits to the works of the Law (comp. Acts 15, 1) could be expected to direct their dangerous attention also to the flourishing church at Rome, though they had not as yet made their appearance there, the Apostle in a sort of a supplement earnestly warns his readers to have an eye on these false teachers that were the authors of the well-known dissensions and defections from the faith that the Roman Christians had been taught, and to avoid all communion with them (17). For such men are not serving Christ and His Church, but trying to get means for gratifying their carnal desires and lusts, and to attain this end deceive by their kind and well-set language those that have nothing evil in mind themselves and therefore do not suspect others of having (18). The Apostle is confident that his readers will heed his admonition, since their obedient submission to the

---

V. 16. Ἐν denotes the manner in which the greeting was to be performed. "Holy kiss": one that is distinct from a common one; 1 Pet. 5, 14 it is called the "kiss of love", or, of appreciation and esteem (ἀγάπης).

V. 17. "Brethren": comp. 15, 14. Σκοπεῖν: observe carefully, keep the eye on. "The divisions": the well-known ones. Σκάνδαλα: offences, causes of stumbling, temptations to fall away from the true Christian doctrine. Παρά: beside, deviating from, contrary to. "You": emphatic; others might not have enjoyed the same privilege. Ἐκκλίνατε: turn away from (ἀπό), avoid them, go out of their way.

V. 18. Οἱ τοιοῦτοι: they that are of such a character. ὃ δουλεύουσιν: they fail or refuse to serve; mark the unexpected position of the negation. "But their own belly" they do serve: in their selfishness (ἐαυτῶν emphatic) they think merely of a luxurious life (comp. Phil. 3, 19). Χρηστολογία refers to the contents, εὐλογία to the form: kindly and plausible language. Τῇς χρηστ. κτλ.: *their*, etc. Ἀνάκων: guileless, harmless, unsuspecting.

Gospel is of world-wide repute; hence he can rejoice over them whilst others cause him anxiety and sorrow. But he also wants them to remain in this blessed state and condition, and this will be the case only when they prove themselves wise in prizing and holding fast the good they have in their true faith and doctrine, and have nothing whatever to do with the evil that threatens them from those false teachers (19). And they can rest assured that God, the Lover and Author of peace, will stand by them in their struggle against those strife-causing false teachers and Satan, their head and father, and give them a complete victory over this hellish serpent and his pernicious brood in a short time.

Here the Apostle evidently meant to close his letter, adding his usual final wish that the grace of Christ the Savior of mankind, this only source of all true happiness, may be and abide with them (20).

*F. Greetings sent by the Companions of Paul: Vv. 21-23.*

When just about to close his letter Paul was asked by his companions and friends at Corinth to send also their greetings to the brethren at Rome. The first one who did so was his faithful disciple and assistant missionary Timothy; then followed three relatives of Paul, or Jewish Christians (21). Tertius, to judge from his name a Roman by descent like Gaius and Quartus, to whom Paul according

---

V. 19. Ὑμῶν is emphatic: you do not belong to the simply harmless and unsuspecting who possess the harmlessness of doves but lack the wisdom of serpents (Matt. 10, 16), but rather excel in obedience to the Gospel; hence I am hopeful as to you. "Over you" (emphatic) "therefore I rejoice." "Wise with regard to . . . unmixed (pure, innocent, guileless) with regard to (εἰς)." "The good" and "the evil" is meant in general, but as including especially what the context here speaks of: true and false doctrine and their results.

V. 20. "Will crush Satan": evidently an illusion to Gen. 3, 15. False teachers are instruments of Satan, serving his purpose, even if unconscious of it (comp. 2 Cor. 11, 13-15). "Under your feet": a brief expression for "having him put under your feet". God will conquer Satan through His Church, giving her the victory over him. Ἡ χάρις καὶ, scil. εἰς or ἔστω.

V. 21. "My fellow-worker": comp. verse 3. "My kinsman": comp. verse 7.



to his custom had dictated the letter (comp. 1 Cor. 16, 21; Gal. 6, 11; Col. 4, 18; 2 Thess. 3, 17), of course sent his Christian greeting in his own name (22). Gaius, perhaps the same that is mentioned 1 Cor. 1, 14, was the Christian at Corinth with whom Paul staid during his second sojourn in that city, as he had done with Aquila and Priscilla during his first (Acts 18, 1 sqq.); but his hospitality extended to all Christians. Erastus, the treasurer of the rich city, is a proof that already in those first times the Christians counted among their number some men of high standing in the community (23).

G. Concluding Doxology: Vv. 25-27.

The Apostle in the three last verses sums up the main thoughts of the epistle in the form of a sublime doxology, declaring that never-ending glory and praise should be given through Jesus Christ, through whom alone anything we do can be acceptable to God, to Him who is able also to establish in true faith those that have become Christians, so that they can endure to the end and thus be saved (comp. Matt. 10, 22). But this He will do only in accordance with, and by, the Gospel preached by Paul and his fellow-apostles, which is nothing else but the glorious tidings of Jesus Christ, the Savior of mankind. And this preaching again takes place in accordance with the revelation of the divine counsel of salvation that was kept silent through all the centuries bordering on eternity (25), but now, at the time of the New Testament, is manifested and made known through the

---

V. 22. "In the Lord": to be construed with "salute"—the greeting of a Christian to Christians (comp. verse 2).

V. 23. Erastus, because of his office mentioned here, can scarcely be identical with the traveling assistant of Paul mentioned Acts 19, 22 and 2 Tim. 4, 20. Some suppose that he had resigned his secular office to accompany the Apostle; but the name Erastus was very common. "The brother": fellow-Christian; the Apostle had nothing especial to say about him. If he had been the brother of Gaius, *αὐτοῦ* would have been added to *ἀδελφός*.

V. 24. This verse is merely a repetition of the benediction in verse 20, omitted in the best manuscripts and in all critical editions.

V. 25. *Στηρίξαι*: to make firm and constant. *Κατά*: manner and norm. *Καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*: appositional explanation of "my Gospel"; comp. 2, 16; 2 Tim. 2, 8. *Ἰησοῦ Χ.*: the objective genitive; according to others the subjective: Christ is Himself the real

explanation of the prophetical writings of the Old Testament, in obedience to the commandment of God given to the apostles (comp. Titus 1, 3; Matt. 28, 19 sq.), so that the eternal will of God is now fully revealed. And this is done in order to make all nations obedient to God and His Christ in faith (26). Thus God is recognized as alone wise, since only He could find such an admirable, all-sufficient plan of salvation for us poor sinners. Yea, praise and glory be to Him forevermore! Amen.

preacher, the Apostle only His servant and instrument. *Κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*: norm and manner of the preaching, hence not coordinate with the first *κατά*, but subordinate to it; others take the opposite view, making also the second *κατά* dependent on *στηρίζαι*. *Μυστήριον*: comp. 11, 25. It is without the article here because in the first place to be taken in the general sense of "a mystery" which then is defined by the following participles. *Ἀποκάλυψιν* can be definite without the article because dependent on a preposition and modified by a genitive. "In times eternal" (dative of time): a popular expression for primeval, pristine times.

V. 26 sq. *Φανερωθέντος*: comp. Col. 1, 26. *Διὰ τε γραφῶν κτλ.*: intimately connected with the preceding clause (*τέ*), the *φανερωθῆναι* taking place in this way that the prophetical writings were used as the basis, proof, and confirmation of the Gospel preaching. This was done in the first place by Jesus Himself (e. g., Luke 24, 27. 44; John 5, 39), and then continued by His disciples (e. g., Acts 2, 16 sqq.; Rom. 1, 17). "The eternal God": the God who in eternity already had resolved to save man and made the plan of salvation. "Unto obedience of faith": to cause submission to faith as the divinely-appointed norm of salvation (comp. 1, 5; Acts 6, 7). "Unto all the nations": no man and no class of men excepted. Such the redemptive counsel of the God that loved the world (John 3, 16) had to be (comp. Gen. 12, 3; 18, 18). "Through Jesus Christ": logically to be connected with "to whom be the glory", not with "the only wise God"—who through the whole redemptive work of Christ has proven Himself the only wise God, since this would be an unnatural connection. The relative *ὃς*, to be referred to *θεῷ*, is grammatically superfluous; it takes up the dative *τῷ δυναμένῳ* at the beginning of the sentence (verse 25). If omitted the sentence, though somewhat involved, is complete and clear. The verbal form *εἴη* or *ἔστω* is also here to be supplied (comp. verse 20). "Unto the eternities of the eternities": unto all eternity—the strongest expression possible.

## THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM IN THE JOINT SYNOD.

REV. J. SHEATSLEY, DELAWARE, O.

Our Synod is an institution of the Church; it must do the work of the Church. What is that work? Christ said to the apostles, Go ye and make disciples of all nations. To make disciples of Christ, believers, children of God, was the work of the Church then; it is the work of the Church yet. Many changes pertaining to external methods of doing this work may have taken place, but the work in its essence remains the same and will remain the same until the consummation of the kingdom. It should be clear, therefore, that when any Christian body which has set before itself to do the work of the Church, engages in anything else than making disciples or saving souls, its action needs explanation and defense. The fact itself that it is engaged in any such work is not a priori evidence that it has departed from its divinely established purpose. The work that is being done may be indirectly necessary to the conversion of souls. It is not claimed for it that it converts souls or is in any real sense a means of grace. When a congregation erects a house of worship it is not engaged directly in making disciples, for disciples are made by applying the means of grace, yet it is doing a work that is at least relatively essential. A little explanation on the part of the congregation may be necessary, but hardly any defense of its action. There are other works in which the Church must engage, which, though they do not consist directly in making disciples, are nevertheless necessary in order that the greatest possible number of disciples may be made. Paul supported himself by the labor of his own hands that he might win the more for Christ. For the same reason we support educational institutions and publish books and periodicals. But when shall the Church stop? Everything hangs together by a logical connection, for there is one God over all and one mind has built all things and one grand purpose is being worked out. But is a work justified simply by pointing out such a connection? Joint Synod, if it had the means, might buy a coal mine, on the ground that it needs fuel to run a steel plant, by means of which it wants to make money for its depleted missionary treasury. There seem to be plenty of professed workers in the Church who are ready to say that such a freak would

be all right. The end, no matter how far off or by what circuitous path reached, justifies the means. Evidently then there is a limit in these things. Certain works which are not of a spiritual nature there are that the Church must do in order that it may carry out the Lord's command, but she must know what these things are and stop with them, and not assert the right to compass sea and land to make a proselyte. Just which activities these are or on what principle the limit is fixed, it is not my purpose to show. I wish here only to call attention to the fact in view of what shall be said further on.

It will help to clear matters up a little by stating here yet that there is a certain class of Church activities, which, although they are not essentially of an evangelistic nature, are yet never called in question by the true Christian. They do not at all belong to that class of works whose primary aim, whether direct or indirect, is the conversion of souls, but are the fruits of the love which discipleship has engendered. They are known as works of charity and embrace such as caring for the poor, supporting orphanages, asylums and the like. The limit here is that drawn by Christian love, and this, we can say, is limitless. Of course, with reference to the support of such institutions, about the same questions arise as in the direct execution of Christ's commission, Preach the Gospel. Not every method of supporting institutions of charity is Christian.

The Church's work is to make disciples. How is this done? By applying the means of grace. For a Lutheran this is no open question. God's word has settled it. Conversion is the work of God's Spirit and that Spirit is pleased to operate through the divinely ordained means of grace, the word and sacraments. No amount of training or culture through the application of natural, moral and intellectual forces can accomplish this result. Conversion is not a work of nature but of grace, and it is possible only through the means of grace which God has set apart for that end. For many a professed worker in the Church these statements would require much elaboration to make them plain, if indeed he could be convinced at all, but for a live child of the Reformation all this has been elaborated and he has accepted the results. It is a hard saying that no amount of humanistic effort can convert a soul or even bring it nearer the kingdom of God, but it is a true saying and loyalty to the truth demands its faithful proclamation to the world, especially at the present, when the sharp de-

markation between the spheres of grace and truth is so largely ignored. Here is one of the great fundamentals! Indeed, our case may be said to be lost just in proportion as we depart from the principle that the kingdom of God is built up by the simple preaching of the Gospel. To the Jew it is a stumbling block and to the Greek foolishness, but to every one that believeth, it is the power of God and the wisdom of God. *"My kingdom is not of this world."* If this fundamental of the upbuilding of Zion were not endangered, there would be no great need of crying out in its behalf, but it is endangered. It is endangered already by the lowest type of kissing-bee or church fair, whose aim is financial churchly support; it is endangered by the more honorable method of filling the Church's treasury by means of some mercantile or industrial activity; it is at least threatened by the broad schemes of liberal and even technical education, planned by distinctively churchly bodies; it is endangered by the false notion that education and culture are morality and that morality is religion; it is endangered by the prevalent opinion that a church's influence is measured by its intellectual standard; it must always be settled here first what kind of influence is meant; it is endangered by the false fundamental and Pelagian conception of the fall and of man's natural state that there is still left in the natural man certain power of self-regeneration and redemption; it is endangered by the boastful, higher criticism that allows no divine dictum which does not square with its own supposed infallible laws. In my opinion the questions, How shall the Church's work be done? How shall disciples be made? is not at large settled yet. In the mind of a true Lutheran it is settled, but not all are Lutherans, and we need to look to our moorings lest we find ourselves drifting in a strange current.

We then, the Joint Synod of Ohio and other states, a part of the kingdom of God which is not of this world — we are to make disciples of Christ; that is our work, and we are to do this by preaching the Gospel. That must be the point of pressure, the direct resultant of all our forces. We are glad, too, to be able to say, as we look back over the past history of our Synod, that this, by the grace of God, has always been done. The founders of our theological seminary at Columbus had in view, of course, only the preparation of young men for the ministry. But when, several decades later, the first stones of Capital University were laid, this was likewise done for the good of the ministry,

for it was designed to prepare men for the seminary and so make it possible to send forth a more efficient ministry. Attempts were made several times, it appears, to place Capital University in the front rank of educational institutions of a general character. It should, of course, primarily prepare men for the seminary, but it should at the same time prepare men for other callings in life. These attempts, however, always proved more or less abortive, with the result that almost all the alumni have found their life's calling in the Gospel ministry. The list of graduates for the fifty years of the institution's existence shows that about four out of every five have devoted themselves to the work of the Church, either as pastors or professors.

It has often been lamented that Synod has never been able to do little else than to educate ministers. There is no imposing list of men renowned in education, medicine, law, literature, art, statesmanship, or the mechanical arts to which we can point young men as a drawing card for our institution. This is rather humiliating for those who have an eye to worldly greatness. We never have been able to get the means nor the men to build up an institution of that kind. Whether we ever shall is perhaps another question. But there is still a third question, **Do we ever want to?** I said that we have lamented that we have never been able to contribute more to the educated world outside of the Gospel ministry. But on a closer study may there not be something here, some overruling purpose of God, that should turn our lamentations into rejoicing? Is the present condition of those churches that are largely given to the work of general and even technical education really desirable from the *standpoint of grace or revealed truth?* Is the rationalistic spirit of higher criticism which seeks to bring the Bible down to the level of human productions, or the self-righteous spirit which largely sets aside the atonement and makes salvation depend rather upon one's manner of living, or that unionistic spirit that ignores essential differences between denominations, and even between the Christian and other religions, and finds a heavenly welcome awaiting all who are sincere in their views, or that semi-worldly spirit that seeks to bridge over the chasm between the Church and the world—are these desirable forces to have applied in the making of disciples? But it will be asked, Is higher education responsible for these conditions? Not necessarily so, I reply, but practically I believe it is in a very large measure. By higher education I mean that

which is to be had in our leading colleges and universities, where the academic chair does not wear a straight jacket of traditions or ecclesiastical standards, but is free to pursue its course in science and philosophy according to the declared laws of the mind. The leading universities of Europe and of our own country seem to bear out the fact that in educational institutions of the above type there is a diverging from revealed truth, and where the religious idea still prevails there is a kind of syncretism of religion and world, of revealed truth and science and philosophy falsely so-called.

But a Lutheran will reply, That is not the kind of education that we are aiming at—we mean to teach the arts and the sciences together with philosophy, but to do this along the lines of revealed truth. Just so, and for that very reason your institution would be unpopular and could never rank with the so-called leading educational institutions. Young men who want to prepare themselves for the ministry, especially if they are good Lutherans, are willing to be guided by the landmarks of revealed truth, not only in the theological, but also in the collegiate department, but aspirants to secular professions, in whom religion is probably a minor factor or even a minor quantity, want a broad license in the pursuit of knowledge, and they will go where they can enjoy that license. But aside from this fact there is another feature of the case; in my opinion only the few, both among students and professors, are capable of launching out into the broad expanses of literature, arts, science and philosophy and still keep strictly within the bounds of revealed truth, let alone ecclesiastical standards. Siren voices are heard and too many will not close their ears. This is no reason, however, why Lutherans also should not attempt to investigate these fields of knowledge, if they are called to do so. All things are possible with God. Temptations exist everywhere and men of God will resist them. But the thought is this: we should not rashly enter “where angels fear to tread.” However, if I were convinced that our Synod has been called of God to enlarge its educational course so as to take in what is taught in the leading colleges, I trust that I would be among the first to encourage the movement.

But have we been called to that work? I will not undertake here to decide that question, yet a condition holds in our midst which in my estimation is practically decisive: I do not believe that a religious body that must gain the

financial support of its institutions of learning, as the Joint Synod of Ohio must, by offerings from rich and poor, old and young, and where the support is so meager, has any right to use that money for any other purpose than to train laborers for the vineyard of the Lord. Our institutions at Columbus and elsewhere may be able to do considerable work outside of that to which Synod has been directly called without any, or at least without any great, additional expense; but to divert any large amount of these hard-earned offerings to the equipment of academic chairs which are not needed as a preparation for the theological department, would, in my estimation, be a subversion of God's purpose in our midst. If Synod had constituents who were willing to give their thousands and millions, then the case would, I believe, be largely different, though even then yet the question would be in place whether the Church should engage in these things, or whether if these large amounts are in reality given to the Church, not more could be accomplished in the service of the Master, if they were applied directly to the making of disciples. But we have no such contributions and this is an indication that we should keep strictly to the business of the Master, to preaching the Gospel. Let us not forget that that is the Church's work and that is what we are trying to do. Let us not forget either that that will count in the end. "Ye are the salt of the earth," "Ye are the light of the world." Let us rather be the salt of the earth and the light of the world than a show in the world. We often hear and see it stated that the Lutheran church in this country, if it would be a church of influence, must educate so as to possess a roll of honor in science, art and statesmanship. Brethren, I believe that the Lutheran Church in this country has been called to preach the Gospel and not to teach science and philosophy, and that the more closely it adheres to its divine call the greater will be its influence *for good*. Whatever she does in other fields is done indirectly and with its root in evangelical truth. There are many things that make a show in the world, but there is only one thing that saves the world. Let us aim to do that one thing. God will then be with us and our influence will be great. What Dr. Charles P. Krauth said in regard to healing the division of the Church applies here also: "God's grace alone can heal His Church. God's grace has its great administrator, the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost has His sufficient means, the Word and Sacraments, and these regenerate men as co-workers with



God the Holy Ghost. God alone can do it efficiently; man's part is as God's most humble instrument. God's grace can do it, not panaceas of human compounding, nor machinery of human device. The Holy Spirit can do it, not the spirit of humanity, culture, progress, science, refinement or popular education." We are here to lift men up to God, God's grace applied in Word and sacrament is the only leaven with which we can do this. It is, of course, unpopular at the present time for a church to confine itself to this work. Churches want to take a hand in politics and in all manner of the so-called social reforms. Not like the Pope and yet essentially Popish they will rule the Church and at the same time, through petition, resolution, lobbyism and boycotting, wield the sword of state. Especially too are they ambitious to lead in secular education and get themselves a name. To refrain from all this is unpopular and we are said to be a church of little influence. Here also Dr. Krauth has a word of comfort: "A popular religion is never a pure religion. The severest thing which can be said of a minister of Christ is that he has no enemies. It could not be said of the Master. Rather is it true that no man ever had so many enemies and such bitter ones. He says: 'Wo unto you when all men speak well of you.' And what is true of the Master and of the teachers is true of the Church. The Church, admired by the world, praised by it, flocked to by it, enriched by it, is not the Church as Christ designs it. The Church which bears reproach for His name now, which is hated by the careless, the politic, the fashionable, is like His Church in all its purest time. 'If they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept My saying, they will keep yours also.'" We are laborers in the Lord's vineyard, in the kingdom of God, and that kingdom is not of this world and it is therefore folly for us to expect to enjoy the world's favor and sympathy. We don't want them. We will also exert a more wholesome influence upon those outside the kingdom of God, if we attend strictly to the business of the Master, instead of dabbling in all manner of humanistic attempts at elevating the race.

But if these statements are true, is the inference then this that Synod needs to do no more for its institutions of learning in the future than it has done in the past? Is Capital University, for example, not to be enlarged, neither in its curriculum nor in the capacity and quality of its teaching

force? Not at all. There is plenty of room for improvement and enlargement, but this can be done without trespassing on forbidden ground. Have we in Capital University, for example, a thorough distinctively English course or a thorough distinctively German course? Yet just these are some of the first collegiate essentials in a preparation for the seminary. Let the candidate of theology be efficient in these, if he knows not a word of Greek, Latin or Hebrew. There are other things that could be added to great advantage, for example, that more attention be paid to music, both theoretical and practical, and to church music in particular, likewise to the art of speaking. Such additions would require more teaching force. There should be a greater teaching force for the branches already taught. This would enable the teacher to specialize more and so to become more efficient in instruction. In short there is plenty of room here for the application of large additional funds and all this along the line of distinctively pro-seminary training. That's the thing. We want laborers in the vineyard of the Lord and we want the very best. As to the seminary itself, there is no question but that improvements could be made here also. My conclusion here then is this: Our educational institutions are schools of prophets. Let us keep that fact in view and let the meagre funds of Synod be applied strictly to this end. So long as we hear the cry, "The harvest is great, but the laborers are few," Joint Synod above all others has no money to scatter in distinctive arrangements for fitting men for worldly callings. Whoever finds in the curriculum of these institutions what he wants, though he has not the ministry in view, is not only welcome, but we urge such to come and they can be assured in the beginning that they have made no mistake in their choice.

The Church is to make disciples, to preach the Gospel. The ultimate work of our Synod therefore is not in its schools of learning, but in the parish and in the mission field. Our colleges and seminaries are but means to an end. No one therefore can have the proper conception of what the nature and aim of our educational institutions should be who does not view them from the parish and mission field. For that reason too pastors and missionaries may be able to teach our professors something with reference to these institutions.

First of all here, there are two sources of demand, established parishes and the mission field. We need a

source of supply for our established congregations. The allotted life of the minister according to the newest reckoning is only two score and ten or at most three score years. New men must therefore slip in to fill up the depleted ranks. But if Synod had no other demand to meet than this the problem of supply would not be difficult. There seems to have been a time in the history of Synod when there was little thought of doing more than to hold what it already had. More or less extension was constantly taking place, but it was done through individual rather than through synodical effort. Synod has many shining missionaries to show up scattered all through her history and these traveling preachers kept up a demand for all the men that individual or institutional effort could in those days supply. New fields then could be opened with less difficulty and expense than now. The field seemed to be riper, at least, more ready to hear and receive the Word of life.

But whatever missionary work was done in the past our Synod with the Church at large has in the last fifteen or twenty years waked up to a sense of the need of missionary activity not known before. This soon resulted at the instigation of the English District in the organization of the Synodical Mission Board. Synod then made strong efforts to extend its boundaries and this too in a systematic manner. These efforts are growing from year to year. This is as it should be. The great mission of the Church is missions. When this is no longer the case, when the kingdoms of the world have become the kingdoms of the Lord, then the Lord Himself will come and resolve His Church into its final state, the kingdom of glory. This point of time has not come yet and so long as the harvest is white we need to be up and doing. When the farmer's wheat is ripe he leaves all else and looks after the harvest. We Lutherans especially, we claim to be the Church of the pure Word and sacraments, and we of the Ohio Synod in particular who claim to be the exponents of the purest Lutheranism in this country, why should we not lead in scriptural missionary activity? I was about to suggest that we shift the storm center of Synod a little more toward the side of direct missionary work. That however might weaken our institutions and we cannot afford to do that, we must hold what good we have. But we can do this, we can shift our missionary work over under the direct pressure of the storm-center. Then the object will be not to build up great edu-

cational institutions as such, but to direct these and all other efforts of Synod toward the one great end of making disciples of Christ. I do not believe that we have been doing this, even in late years, to the extent that we should have done. We have men traveling back and forth through Synod searching every nook and corner for the purpose of raising funds for the great cause of higher Christian education, while the greater cause of missions is largely left to take care of itself. We are making great efforts to raise a hundred thousand for Capital University, but the already tiny rill of missionary support appears to be becoming more tiny still. I understand that Synod has appropriated more for missions for the next two years than had been done for the two just past, for which I am glad, but the actual income of the last year seems to have fallen off. I trust we will get the hundred thousand, if not this present semi-centenary year, then in a few years to come, but surely we cannot afford to leave the other undone. Indeed, if for the sake of special educational efforts our missionary work shall be crippled, then for the sake of our Master and for the sake of Synod let us have no more semi-centennial jubilees nor jubilee funds. But I do not particularly fear this, yet I feel that the cause of missions needs more agitation in our midst. We are not as zealously affected as we should be. The missionaries already in the field are not receiving the support they deserve and that untrammelled work at their posts demands. Then too we are not going in and possessing the land or post as we might be. Others with less reason and right are preempting the claims. Some may decry us as missionary enthusiasts. Very well, I for one am thankful for the epithet, only that enough knowledge is coupled with zeal to keep in proper relation all other needs of the Church.

But it is replied that the Mission Board already has more calls for men than it can meet. No less than fifteen are calling, Come over and help us. Does this not show that it is our training schools that need our attention rather than the mission work itself? The field is before us, the doors are open, and that without any special effort on our part, what we need is men to go in and possess the land. Fill our schools, secure students who will give themselves to the Gospel ministry, that seems to be the first demand upon Synod. It is, but some other things must be done also. Indeed, if these other things are not done, we will likely have poor success in filling our schools just as has

been the case for some years already. The explanation is largely here that unless a young man has a reasonable hope of securing a fair position after he has finished his course of training, he will not begin the course. No young man will study law if he has no reasonable hope of making a fair living at the business. This may appear like lowering the calling of the ministry to a commercial basis, but right or wrong, these things must at the present time be considered. The apostles went forth without a fixed salary and without a synod behind them to guarantee their support, many others did so and a few are doing so yet, but it is not the rule, the Church does not now expect its men to go forth in that way. It is her desire to give her laborers, if possible, a comfortable living so that they may be relieved from all care about carnal things. That is the position of our Synod. If we now fail to do this, if our missionaries already in the field are hampered in their work through lack of support and are even subjected to suffering and needless discouragements, then we need not expect our Mission Board to be embarrassed by too many appeals, Here am I, send me; nor will our halls of learning be crowded with applicants for the Gospel ministry. Even ministers do not care to bear more crosses than is absolutely necessary.

But that is not all, if the men already in the field are not receiving the proper support, especially that the amounts are not promptly paid, how shall we send forth more laborers? I yet hear the echo of the cry that our schools were turning out more men than we needed. Perhaps the cry originated with some brother who was nearing the so-called dead line and feared that he might be crowded out by a young man. His fears may have not been altogether ungrounded, but be that as it may, we never had too many candidates for theology, we never had enough. But I can easily see how our schools could furnish more than our missionary authorities would be able to send out at the present rate of missionary contribution. If there is no oversupply at present, it is due in a large measure to a well known law of supply and demand in accordance with which our training schools involuntarily reduced their contingents. To declare that the Mission Board does not have the means to send out and support more men will have a chilling effect upon the enthusiasm of the average young man who thinks of studying for the ministry. We see the same thing in our Teachers' Seminary: if there were a greater demand for

teachers, there would be more students at Woodville. The needed supply for our established congregations is not very great. We must therefore, also for the sake of our educational institutions, more rapidly develop our missionary work, and that especially on its financial side. Instead of an appropriation of \$14,000 a year it should at the least be \$20,000. Put more life into our missionary work and every work of Synod will throb with more interest and activity. That's the nature of missionary effort; it exerts a most wholesome reflex influence. Let us repeat then that it is not Capital University that is the end or center of Synod's labors, but making disciples of Christ, which, of course, implies that we keep those which have been made.

---

## ELOCUTION FOR PREACHERS OR PUBLIC SPEAKING.

BY REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

### ESSENTIALS OF ELOCUTION.

We have now considered the preliminary and necessary introductory parts, those required for the correct understanding of the main portion of the work and for the proper assimilation of the essentials of the subject. There are six things required in all utterance. Not a sentence can be enunciated without them; in other words they are found in the speaking of any sentence however short it may be. So essential are they that they may be said to appear even in the utterance of a word. One factor is *time*. Speak the sentence "God so loved the world," and you see it takes time to say it; one may use more and another less time according to the value and importance he puts upon the words, and according to his nature and disposition. One person may consume only a minute in speaking 120 words, while another utters only 60 and another 40. These six elements are Form, Quality, Time, Pitch, Force, Stress. By the knowledge and use of these elements the speaker has the most excellent equipment for the conveyance of his thoughts and emotions.

The better plan in teaching is not to give all information on one point and then pass on to the other, but to start the pupil on portions of several, and let them learn the value

and importance by the practice of examples, and also let the light down by gradual steps, theory and practice keeping pace, thus keeping up the interest and stimulating the individual to know by acquiring. Here as in divine things "Unto every one which hath shall be given," "They that walk in the light shall see light." Some may read these lines and pronounce them of no value. Others may read them and for the moment, desire to know them experimentally, but let the emotion die. Another may say, what is the value of this at any rate, and thus not even seek to know it. These thoughts with the difficulty of the task in making the subject practically clear, make the effort of composition more doubtful than is conducive to real pleasure.

§ 21. FORM: is the day and night of the voice. All nature has two sides, the bright and the gloomy. These are winter and summer, daytime and night. The winds howl and sigh, the waves beat and roar. Man cries and rejoices. These are a few of nature's lessons; some express both sides, and some only characteristics. Every thoughtful person can soon catch and feel the lesson. What kind of a voice is in place at a funeral? What at a jollification meeting? How would you say the Lord's Prayer? How do you pronounce the benediction? Do you make them conform to occasion and feeling, *or do you just do them?* Let not the objector say that such work is mechanical! It is not true. Nature has the sounds, and has given them to some men, and all may acquire them. When a large tree falls the sound is on the dark side; but if a limb strikes another tree and splits and cracks and sunders, the noises will be bright and sharp.

§ 22. Take the sentence "My happy heart with rapture swells." Repeat it aloud till you feel that way and until you can make others feel that you feel in that mood, and you will utter it in a bright voice. The bright side of the voice is the happy, the cheerful side; it tends to make others cheerful. Can you say "the melancholy days are come, the saddest of the year" in a real bright, happy voice, and be in earnest and feel the sentiment? Repeat the words "I am so sad" with the real meaning of the words reflected in the voice until you feel sad and can impress others with the feeling, and you have learned what is meant by the dark side of the voice. "She is dead, my best and truest friend, my mother," cannot be delivered in a bright voice without making the impression of exultation over the fact of her death.

By this short discussion and these few examples it is easy to get a start on the subject. To me it is one of the most fascinating and beautiful factors in all voice work. It is putting the ear to nature and letting her give forth her voice.

Rev. Luebker, who lately died in Washington, D. C., was an excellent and eloquent preacher. I heard him on several funeral occasions. Once in particular I recall. It was at the funeral of a lady whose husband was a member of my congregation. The sermon was most tender and touching. The tears fell copiously from the preacher's eyes; but the voice was as clear and bright as if he had been telling the happiest thing in his experience. Such a contrast all the people felt, but had not the ability to tell the cause. Another case. A lady of much reputation as a teacher and reader absolutely lacked the dark tones. When I told her of it, she cried out and said, can they be acquired? Once in a while a person is found who lacks one or the other; but in all my experience I have not found one who could not by intelligent practice acquire it.

§ 23. There are shades of the bright and dark. Not all bright tones are equally bright, and not all dark tones are equally dark. For the sake of information and practice they are usually enumerated from 1 to 9 in this way:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

No. 5 is normal form; that is, it is to be the middle of the voice, half bright and half dark. No. 1 is the brightest possible and No. 9, the darkest possible. Hence No. 3, is normal bright and No. 7, normal dark. Form 1 to 5 is the bright side of the voice; 1 is as bright as it can be made and 5 is half bright and half dark—normal form. 3 is normal bright or the middle of the voice in bright, and 7 is normal dark or the middle of the voice on the dark side. It is a beautiful exercise to take any good vowel sound like o or oo and run it over the whole nine degrees of form keeping the same pitch all the way through and letting the different shades appear without any impulse on the various numbers.

§ 24. Form applies to any and all pitches; but it is important that in this exercise the pitch be kept uniform, otherwise one may be deceived in what form is, and run into aspiration or some other impurity and call it form.



No one should attempt this feat until he knows what form is and has established it in his voice. Then he will find profit and pleasure in it.

§ 25. There is meaning in form. The bright side is the physical or the side of force and means cheerfulness, vitality. The dark is the soul side or the side of the emotions and means gloom, solemnity. He who uses the bright throughout a discourse will tire himself and his audience and will not appeal to the heart in man but to his lowest motives. The dark means sympathy, tenderness, an appeal to the highest powers, soothes and placates. The bright antagonizes, fires, exalts, rejoices. The dark in the high pitch imitates the moan of the wind and the howl of a dog; in the low it portrays the roll of thunder and the surging of the waves. The bright in the high pitch is the height of exultation and ecstasy; in the low it is profound without being solemn.

The more the dark is used the richer the voice will become and the smoother the walls of the throat. All irritation will pass away and a sense of ease and comfort follows. Many mistake aspiration for dark tones. Aspiration rasps the throat, exhausts and depresses, while the dark tones give ease and pleasure to the speaker and satisfy the hearer.

§ 26. Form is one of the elements in modulations. The voice does not remain for any length of time on any one form as 1, or 3, or 7, or 8; but plays back and forth in several according to the character of the utterance. This holds good in nearly all general or regular work. Once in a while the dark or very dark may be used for some time, and so in the bright.

Form has much to do with the meaning of literature and of discourse; with the correct understanding and rendering of it.

Bible and hymn reading must, to be effective, make use of form, or be controlled by the meaning portrayed by correct use of form. In this way without any effort or dramatic effect, the solemn and blessed character of the Word and the holiness and aspirations of the hymn can be easily brought forth. The voice should be on its dark side most of the time in such reading.

Combined with pitch and quality the use of form enables one to portray all the emotions of the soul. When the other two have been set forth, exercises will be given in which all can be combined. We will now confine our-

selves to those which illustrate and set forth form for its correct understanding and for the growth of the voice in it.

§ 27. Exercises: 1. I am so happy. I am so sad.

2. Bright. One by one, in the infinite meadows of heaven, blossomed the lovely stars, the forget-me-nots of the angels.

3. With varying shades of bright and dark.

"How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank!

Here will we sit and let the sound of music

Creep in our ears; soft stillness and the night

Become the touches of sweet harmony.

Sit Jessica: look how the floor of Heaven

Is *thick* inlaid with patins of bright *gold*;

There's not the smallest orb which Thou beholdest

But in his motion like an *angel* sings,

Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims;

Such harmony is in immortal souls;

But whilst this muddy vesture of decay

Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

4. This one combines *pitch* and form. It is given as the best known, and if practiced as directed will eventually bring the dark tones in any voice.

There are nine pitches and nine degrees of form. Make yourself a diagram—a square—high enough to put the figures from 9 to 1, beginning at the top with nine according to the sense in pitch; and long enough horizontally for the nine degrees of form. Begin at the low right hand corner with the first words and as you repeat them let the voice rise in pitch gradually till it reaches its highest pitch: at the same time let it progress in form from 9 to 1, so that by the time the sentence is finished you will have traveled the hypotenuse of your diagram from No. 1 pitch to No. 9, and from No. 9 form to No. 1. In the first line just say how it roars—only using roars once, permitting the voice to linger on it and to slide down in pitch as much as possible and to be as dark as the real sound. Commit it and all other to memory and practice anywhere and at all suitable times.

"How it roars, roars, roars,

In the iron under-caverns,

In the hollows of the shores;

How it roars anew and thunders,

As the strong hull splits and sunders,

And the spent ship, tempest-driven,  
On reef lies rent and riven—  
How it roars!"

5. Sentences in which all nine degrees of form are used. The italic words mark them.

Bright to dark.

How *brightly sets the sun*—the *purple light fades* from the sky; the twilight *deepens* into *night* and all the *earth* is wrapt in *gloom*.

Dark to bright.

*Night* lingers *long*, but the *misty morning pales* the east, and *glowing rays of light* burst on the *sight*, and *brightly* shines the *sun*.

In closing this article the writer is impelled to say that he feels deeply interested in the fate of these few lines on Form. Brother, do you catch the meaning and importance of it? The living teacher is so necessary in exhibiting form that real concern is felt. The subject may not be exhibited as it should be. It seems plain to the writer, but is it so to those not initiated into the mysteries of the art? Are there any readers who would be willing to pay a small sum for these articles in a pamphlet, if the plates were preserved and an issue made at the end of them? It would be over one hundred pages, if continued. But shall they be continued?

---

## JUNG STILLING--AND RATIONALISM.

BY REV. J. C. SCHACHT, A. B., MARION, IND.

The eighteenth century may in general be called the era of the decline of faith in a supernatural revelation. Here we find the origin of that tendency in the Lutheran Church, which in the course of time destroyed all reverence for the Word of God, and developed into a blatant atheism. It was a counter-movement to the Reformation, opposing the progress of that faith which makes for holiness and salvation. The enlightened human reason was set up as a final court of appeals in all matters of doctrine and faith; and the higher truths of revelation were either boldly denied, or divested of their supernatural element in their interpretation. The Word of God was put on trial before a human court, and what reason as the judge could

not comprehend was rejected as unworthy of acceptance. It is not difficult, of course, to foretell the result of such principles. The outcome could be nothing else than a natural religion, which has no place for Christ in its system, and no use for the Bible as a book of instruction.

In Germany the philosophers Leibnitz, Wolf and Kant gave a special impulse to this movement. In their endeavor to remove the difficulties, which human thought often encounters in attempting to understand the ways and wisdom of God in nature and grace, they united the theological and cosmological conceptions in their philosophy. In this way they hoped to satisfy the thinking mind, and relieve faith of a portion of its burden, and thus render a service to mankind. From this point of view, however, their work was worse than a failure. Instead of clearing up difficulties, they multiplied them; instead of removing doubts from the hearts of the people, they intensified them to the point of a complete rupture with faith. In this way the spirit of rationalism, which passed over the blooming, fruitful acres of God's Church, blasted many a prospering plant beyond recovery; and laid waste the fields, which an industrious, God-fearing people had endeavored, with patience and much toil, to make fertile and productive. Charles P. Krauth in his *Conservative Reformation* shows us the result of that movement in the following words: "Refined and Vulgar Rationalism, mainly distinguished by their degree of candor, \* \* \* divided the ministry, \* \* \* broke up the liturgical, catechetical, and hymnological life, and destroyed the souls of people. Unblushingly infidelity took on it the livery of the Church. Men had rejected the Faith of the Rule, and were still good Lutherans. Why not reject the Rule of Faith, and be good Lutherans? The faith of those men of the olden times, men who were, by more than two centuries wiser than their fathers, had proved to be mere human speculation. Why might not the Rule be? They soon settled that question, and the Bible was flung after the Confession, and men were allowed to be anything they pleased to be, and to bear any name they chose." Such was the condition of the Church in the days of Johann Heinrich Jung, with the assumed name Stilling, of whose life, work, and training the following sketch presents a brief outline.

Stilling was born on the 12th of September, 1740, in the village of Grund in the duchy of Nassau. His father, Wilhelm Jung, was a tailor by trade, and, at the same time, a village schoolmaster. In his younger years, the son fol-

lowed the occupation of his father. At the age of fourteen, he began to teach the school of a neighboring village, Zellberg. The last two days of each week he taught, and the remainder of the time he spent at the needle at home. But he had as little taste for "instructing boys and girls in A B C," as he had for "making clothes for people." Perhaps the greatest pleasure during this time, he derived from his walks between the two villages. The natural scenery of that romantic region, had an inexpressible charm for him. The spring and autumn mornings, when, from the summit of a hill he saw the sun rising, filling field and forest with a flood of color and light, he regarded as seasons fit for angels to walk the earth. But his career as a teacher at that place was of short duration. In spite of the protests of the peasants, and the tears of their children, he was peremptorily discharged through the influence of the pastor. He had committed the unpardonable offense of introducing Arithmetic into his school, which was in those days considered an unsuitable ornament for peasant children. But his experience here was only the beginning of a series of disappointments. From this time up to his twenty-third year, he moved about from place to place, meeting with doubtful success wherever he taught; but following scrupulously the direction of God, whom he was ever to serve. And on account of his many failures as a teacher, he had at one time resolved to settle irrevocably to his trade. Just then, however, an invitation came from a rich merchant, named Spanier, to become a tutor in his family. After considerable hesitation, he at last accepted, and in that capacity for the first time enjoyed some exceptional advantages. Having made Stilling's acquaintance, Spanier discovered that he had excellent gifts, and therefore, gave him opportunities to extend his education. During this time, he studied the French language, and found access to the works of Klopstock, Young and Milton. And from these books, which have poetry as the fore and religion as the background, he derived the greatest enjoyment. Being a man of good taste and of true piety, this poetry was in happy harmony with his own soul. But the kindness that brought him the greatest relief at this time was the paying of his debts. Stilling had, like many other men of genius, the peculiar faculty of spending more than he made. In this respect he was like poor Goldsmith, who often lived from hand to mouth, and sometimes even the hand was empty. Stilling spent six years in the home of Spanier, and then, upon the advice of his master, he resolved to study medi-

cine. Hence we find him in the year 1768, with an empty purse, but with unwavering confidence in God, on his way to Strasburg to enter the university. On his way he had an experience, which it may not be amiss to relate here. His purse having been reduced to one dollar, a merchant of Elberfeld asked him how he expected to secure the means to pay his expenses; and Stilling gave the very characteristic answer: "I have a rich Father in heaven, He will provide for me." Whereupon the merchant replied: "Yes, I am one of your Father's bankers," and then gave him what money he could spare. His residence at Strasburg was an important factor in his development. He not only became acquainted with the best the schools of that day could offer, but he also had the rare fortune of coming in contact socially with some of the greatest men of his time, and perhaps of all time. In 1772 he settled at Elberfeld; and soon established a reputation as an oculist, especially in cases of cataract. But the life of a practitioner was as little to his taste as his occupation of former years. Hence when a chair in the newly established university of Kaiserslautern was offered to him, he at once accepted the position, lecturing on agriculture and commerce. And later on, in 1781, when this school was connected with the university of Heidelberg, he went there, filling a similar position in that center of learning. And in 1787 he exchanged this place for a professorship in the university of Marburg. Thus we find Stilling moving from place to place, acquiring fame under extraordinary circumstances, yet in everything endeavoring to do the will of the Lord, whose humble servant he ever declared himself to be.

But the question that concerns us chiefly in this connection is: What influence had the spirit of the age upon this man, who rose from a tailor's table to a chair in the university? Philosophers of the present time do not grow weary in telling us that the environments of a person "limit and direct the action of his personality; and very often make him, in the lapse of time, to be different from what he was at first." And we know from our own observation, that our surroundings play an important part in the formation of our thought and conduct. And how did Stilling bear up under the pressure of that influence? Having come from the humbler walks of life, one would suppose that he could have been easily carried along with the prevailing currents of thought. There are men who will adopt any vagary, providing it is popular in the circle in which they move. And the majority of the educated men of that time

looked upon faith with profound contempt. Even the preachers, instead of proclaiming the saving message of God to dying souls, entered the pulpits, displaying their apostasy. And besides, Stilling numbered among his friends such persons whose influence was by no means calculated to strengthen a child-like faith in the Word of God. While studying at Strasburg he met the great German poet, Goethe; and that acquaintance very soon ripened into a warm friendship. And it is well known that Goethe, whatever his religious convictions may have been, had no true Christian interest in divine truth. And this might lead one to suppose that Stilling, in order to retain the friendship of this literary giant, yielded to many of his prejudices. But that was not the case. Goethe tells us that "his faith could endure no doubt, and his conviction no mockery." And he pays Stilling the compliment of being a man of sound understanding, having a boundless enthusiasm for the good, the true, and the right. "The element of his energy," he says, "was an indestructible faith in God, and in His immediate help, which manifested itself visibly in an uninterrupted providence, and in unfailing deliverance from every need and every evil."

And yet it appears from his own words, that the philosophy of his time did affect him in a measure. The peace that pervaded his inner life was, at times, seriously ruffled by fatalistic thoughts, suggested by the deterministic philosophy of Wolf. He had devoured this philosophy with great avidity, and it cost him much toil to destroy the poison thus introduced into his life. For twenty long years he fought that giant with his prayers, and after every combat the seducing spirit returned, whispering in his ears that everything is the result either of chance, or of an unchangeable decree of God. The weapon which at last secured him a complete victory over this foe was Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. When he had read this work of the philosopher of Koenigsberg, all his troublesome thoughts vanished as a mist before the rising sun. In this work he had discovered irrefutable proof that human reason knows absolutely nothing outside of the world of sense. And out of gratitude he called this book a commentary on the words of the Apostle Paul: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

But, perhaps, the greatest temptation of his life came through his association with a man named Raschmann.

This man having become one of his satellites, insinuated, with great suavity, doubts of the most essential truths of Christianity into his heart. Thus there was a time when he did not think it inconsistent with Christian faith to regard the vicarious death of Jesus as an oriental fable, invented to adorn the account of Christ's work for humanity. But here also he soon discovered the wolf in sheep's clothing, and he hurled that infidelity from him as a deadly thing. Whilst it is true, therefore, that Stilling was occasionally overcome by the unexpected glitter of human wisdom, yet he always found his way back to his Father's heart before irreparable damage had been done. In an age in which the faith of thousands was wrecked, he preserved his intact, until it brought him into the presence of God, where faith is changed to sight.

And in conclusion I would add that his sturdy, conquering faith was, no doubt, to a great extent the result of his early training. His mother having died when he was but a few years old, his training rested chiefly upon his father. He tells us that his father, with whom he occupied a room in his grandfather's house, was accustomed to awaken him at seven in the morning, and immediately remind him of the goodness of the Lord, the protection of whose guardian angels he had enjoyed through the night. Then they would kneel down together to invoke the blessing of God upon them for the day. After breakfast he was required to read and memorize a portion of the catechism. Also such stories from the Bible and from profane history, as were suitable for his age, he was permitted to read. And the good books that were put into his hands were his constant companions. At the age of seven, he tells us, he had not made the acquaintance of a single child, for his father carefully kept him out of their company. Thus being kept away from all contaminating influences, the ideals of life and character, which he was there forming, could grow unmolested and take complete possession of his soul. At an age when most children have already become familiar with many of the vices of man, he was still happy in the innocence of youth, admiring and cherishing his ideals. In this way he made the Word of God a necessary element of his life, an essential factor for the preservation of his peace and happiness. And while he moved through this half-veiled world with eager feet, laboriously rising from lower to higher possessions, the Word directed him safely through all earthly and material uncertainties. And in its strengthening, comforting and encour-



aging influence he recognized the presence of God, who always brings the life and labor of His children to a successful termination. Thus the example of Stilling powerfully admonishes us to heed the word: "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it."

---

## PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS OF NEW TESTAMENT RESEARCH.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D., COLUMBUS, O.

Although it is the Old Testament which in our day and date occupies the most prominent position in biblical discussion, the present problems of New Testament criticism are of equal fundamental importance. In fact in both departments the issue at stake is the character of the Scriptures. In both, the fundamental question is: What think ye of the Bible? Quite naturally indeed the phases and forms which this problem assumes in connection with the two Testaments, differ in accordance with the literary character and history of the books composing these. That the Old Testament discussions are attracting the greater degree of public attention is largely owing to the fact that these are of a nature that can appeal best to other than special students. The wonderful archæological finds made in Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt and other lands have mainly accrued to the benefit of the Old Testament and have filled out many lacunæ in its records. Then it will be remembered that in Germany, the headquarters of critical Bible research, through the enthusiastic energy of the Wellhausen school, the Old Testament problems, crowding into the background the radical New Testament Tübingen or Baur school, came into the forefront of debate just at that time when the theological thought of the land of Luther in general began to exert so powerful an influence on the Protestant scholarship of the world, and its ideas and ideals became so potent in America that years ago the late Howard Crosby raised his voice of warning against the dangers of "Teutolatry."

While thus partially eclipsed by Old Testament investigations, New Testament research has, nevertheless, been making decided progress in the right direction during recent

years, and can present more tangible and satisfactory, and apparently definite and settled conclusions than Old Testament criticism seemingly will be able to offer for many years to come. Judged by the conclusions presented by the three greatest works in this department that this generation has produced, namely, Harnack's "Chronology of New Testament Literature," Godet's "Introduction to the New Testament," and Th. Zahn's two massive volumes with the same title, the gratifying fact is seen that conservative criticism has made decided progress in New Testament research in late years and that the authenticity and reliability and historical character of the books that compose the New Testament canon has never been so strongly entrenched by historical and critical proofs as is the case now. Only a short generation ago none of the Pauline epistles were recognized as the writings of the great Apostle of the Gentiles except the four composing the "golden chain," viz.: Romans, the two Corinthians, and Galatians. That the fourth Gospel was not the work of the Apostle and that its method and manner of presenting Christ and His work was unhistorical, was considered almost as an axiom. Now all this is changed.

Of the three authorities mentioned, Harnack is both the most liberal and the most brilliant. His standing as a scholar is international, and he is universally recognized as one of the very ablest representatives of the critical school. Yet in his masterly chronology he rejects but a single book of the New Testament, namely, II. Peter, accepting in a modified form as apostolic even the pastoral epistles and John's gospel. While formerly it was contended with considerable vigor that it required a period of more than a hundred years to explain the development of doctrine and life depicted in the New Testament books, Harnack maintains that a period of forty years would be sufficient to give such a background to New Testament literature; so that the entire body could have been written in a little more than a generation. The advocates of the more radical type of criticism have not yet recovered from the amazement that the concessions and conclusions of the great Berlin scholar caused. It amounted to almost a panic, not only because of this step back to the teachings of the Church, but because the principle of tradition is recognized and accepted by Harnack to an extent that seriously undermines the subjective literary canons and methods that radical criticism regards as "scientific."

Still more satisfactory are the conclusions of the French exegete and the German historian. Godet's work, not yet completed, presents the results of the researches of a lifetime by a Bible specialist of recognized world-wide reputation, and his conclusions are all substantially a defence of the traditional teachings of the Church in reference to the New Testament canonical books. But the climax is found in the *Einleitung* of Prof. Zahn, of Erlangen, whose detail researches have by competent authority been declared to be the most scholarly and thorough theological work that the second half of the nineteenth century has produced. Its wealth of data and facts taken from original sources is simply overwhelming. Never has the New Testament been so ably defended as it has been by Zahn, and never in a more scholarly manner. It is true that even the conservative reader may doubt some of the historical combinations made by the acumen and skill of the writer, but these question marks would be found only at places of subordinate importance. Zahn is a defender of the New Testament from beginning to end, and what he has done will never be undone by neological criticism. Nor indeed does he merely revive old views. He meets the adversaries on their own ground and takes from them their weapons and their arms. A work like Zahn's shows what a blessing destructive criticism of the Scriptures may become providentially. Had not the Baur school and the representatives of later destructive criticism attacked the New Testament as they did, none would have ransacked the earliest literature of the Christian era for its evidence in favor of the Bible as this has been done by Zahn, whom no detail or minutiae seems to have escaped. As a consequence and because of the attacks on the New Testament, these books now stand on firmer foundations than ever.

That in this reconstruction and rehabilitation of old truth the investigations also of the neological critics have not been without influence, goes without saying. What makes modern criticism so dangerous is the germ of truth it contains, the abuse and misapplication of which constitutes its stock in trade. There was a germ of truth in the Baur scheme, and this has been appropriated by the best of modern scholarship. Zahn, too, does not merely reproduce what books like Guericke or Horn contend for. He too learned from criticism, and such subjects as the Synoptic Problem have evidently become fixed facts in the New Testament research for all times.

In reference to detail problems it can be stated that there is scarcely a single book of the collection which does not present one or more of these. The Synoptic Problem deals with the literary composition of the first three gospels, which are acknowledged to constitute a group by themselves, and seeks to determine the relation of dependence or independence of these toward each other or toward other sources, oral or written, outside of the present records. The theories in this direction are many, the largest consensus favoring an older form of Mark and the "Sayings" of Matthew, a Hebrew collection of quotations from Christ's teachings, which on the evidence of the Church father, Papias, as recorded in Eusebius' Church History, is claimed to have existed as a separate writing. The Joannine Problem is old and yet ever new, the question being whether the theological picture of Christ as presented by the fourth gospel is really to be traced to the teachings of Christ Himself and is thus historically accurate, or is rather to be regarded as the reflection and speculation of the later Church. In connection with Acts a literary problem of unusual interest has lately come to the front, especially through the efforts of Prof. Blass, of Halle, himself not a theologian, but a Greek specialist of high standing. He has, chiefly on the basis of the peculiar readings of the famous Codex Bezae, also called Codex D, in Canterbury, advocated the theory that St. Luke published two editions, not only of the Acts but also of the third Gospel, and that one of these circulates as the Western or common text as we have it in our Bible, and the other as the Eastern text, found in Codex D, and later Latin and other texts. This theory of a double recession or a revision of a biblical book by its own author has secured considerable approval among the scholars, especially as far as Acts is concerned, among the supporters being Prof. Zöckler, of Greifswald.

This same prominence of the peculiar readings of Codex D, has rather surprisingly led to a revival of the problems of textual criticism, which had been generally considered settled by the joint efforts especially of Tischendorf, Tregelles and Westcott-Hort. It was currently accepted that the virtual agreement of these authorities on the principles and results of textual criticism had resulted in what could be accepted as a final, critical *textus receptus* of the New Testament. These scholars had all based their texts on the Vaticanus, the Sinaiticus and other older manuscripts, but now Blass and others maintain that

the Codex D and others belonging to this class or group, really constitute the best basis for a critically and historically correct New Testament text and insist that the whole process of textual criticism of the New Testament must be done over again, although not agreed as yet in reference to the methods in which this immense task is to be accomplished. The most pronounced exponent of this innovation is the excellent introduction to New Testament Greek by Prof. Nestle, entitled "Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament." Whether this will reopen the whole question of the New Testament text remains to be seen.

In reference to the letters of the New Testament canon the number of problems at any rate as far as apostolic authorship is concerned, is rather decreasing than increasing. The sharpest struggle is still being carried on concerning the Pastoral Epistles, and in these, too, critics are now willing to recognize a Pauline basis, which, they think, was afterwards elaborated into the present form of these epistles. Hebrews has just recently received special attention by the theory advanced by Harnack, who believes that we have in this letter the product of the pen of a woman, and that, all things considered, it is quite probable that it was written by Priscilla possibly in conjunction with her husband Aquila. His rather erudite argument is found in the first issue of the new journal devoted to New Testament research, the *Neutestamentliche Zeitschrift*, edited by Preusschen. The chief interest in the apocalypse now centers in its literary analysis, quite a number regarding it as a composite and combination of several older apocalypses, some of the ingredients being Jewish. The Catholic epistles are still *sub judice* in many respects, but do not receive the attention given to others being of less importance. How unsettled still some of the problems in connection with this group are can be seen from the fact, *e. g.*, that while critics generally regard James as one of the latest New Testament books, Zahn considers it the very earliest, placing it at 50 A. D.

A new interest and zest has been given to the New Testament study by the discovery of a vast amount of contemporary literature of this period in the shape of hundreds of papyri discovered in Egyptian tombs, in inscriptions etc., all of which shed light on the world of thought and the method of thought current in the New Testament times. In the presence of these data and details the New

Testament times become living realities as never before, but of the great mass and multitude of this material we can cite as an example and illustration only one, but this, characteristic and instructive.

The Germans only a comparatively short time ago sent out an expedition to Asia Minor, but they have already been fortunate enough to discover a completely preserved Greek inscription in Priene of eighty-four lines, that has called forth interesting discussions by such leading savants as the Berlin philologist von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, who occupies Curtius' chair, the veteran octogenarian and historian, Mommsen, and the brilliant church historian and theologian, Harnack. The inscription has been published in full in the *Mittheilungen* of the Imperial German Archæological Institute (Vol. 23). It consists of two parts, the second of which is of special interest to the New Testament student. In the first part there is a record of a proposition made to the Procurator of the Province, in reference to a change in the calendar. The second records the decision to the effect that henceforth the various magistrates shall enter upon their duties on the 23d of September, the birthday of the Emperor. In this connection it is that words and expressions are used that seem to have furnished the New Testament writers their models in depicting the Savior. These lines are all the more instructive because, according to Mommsen, the inscription dates from between 11 and 2, B. C., most probably from the year 9, B. C. The lines in question read:

"On this day (*i. e.*, the birthday of Augustus), the world has received an altogether different aspect. It would have been doomed to destruction if a great and good fortune common to all men had not appeared in him who was born on this day. He judges aright who sees in this birthday the beginning of life and of all living powers for himself. Now at last the times are passed when man must be sorry that he has been born. From no other day does the individual and all humanity receive so much good as from this day, which has brought happiness to all. It is impossible to express in words the gratitude that is due for the great blessings which this day has brought.

"The Providence which presides over the destinies of all living creatures, has fitted this man for the salvation of humanity with such gifts that he has been sent to us and to coming generations as a Savior. He will put an end to all strife, and will restore all things gloriously. In his appear-

ance all the hopes of our forefathers have been fulfilled. He not only surpasses all former benefactors of mankind, but it is impossible that a greater than he should yet come. The birthday of this God has brought for the world, the messages of great joy based upon him. From his birth a new era must begin."

Naturally this "Savior" is the Emperor Augustus, and the words in which he is deified, read like those from the gospels. Prof. Harnack, in an interesting discussion of this inscription and its relation to the gospel records, in the *Christliche Welt*, of Leipsic, No. 51, declares that sentiments like these must have been common and current in the world of thought during the New Testament era, and furnished the method and manner in which the writers of the gospels and epistles gave expression to their high ideas. They appropriated for their own use the words which were used for the worship of Cæsar, and employed them for the worship of Christ.

---

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.

IN the *Theol. Litteraturzeitung*, No. 14, Professor Ed. Nestle contributes an interesting note on the order of the New Testament books as currently printed in our texts and translations. Professor Dobschatz, in announcing the edition of the Greek New Testament edited by Nestle and published by the Württemberg Bible Society at a nominal price, the object being to supplant in popular use the cheap *textus receptus* edition issued by the Bible Societies, had stated that the Nestle New Testament was the only edition of the Greek text as far as known that had in the arrangement of the books followed the order adopted by Luther, and considered this a mistake, as the German translation, which is published with the Greek, should have been adapted to the latter and not *vice versa*. In reply Nestle draws attention to the wonderful divergency and difference that exist in reference to the order of books in the New Testament manuscripts. In Westcott-Hart, § 422, the multitude of arrangements are described, and in Berger's *Historie de la Vulgate* no fewer than thirty-eight such arrangements are mentioned, and in the light of these facts the arrangement

in Nestle is to be regarded as a serious fault. In this connection attention is drawn to a noteworthy precedence for this order, namely to the only edition of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament which have ever been published together in one and the same volume, that of Chr. B. Michaelis, in 1841. Cf. Reuss. Bibliotheca, p. 158. In the Thesli edition, which might be mentioned in this connection, the Apocrypha are lacking. Nestle concludes: "It is high time that to the thousands of editions of the Bible in modern languages, finally one should be added containing a satisfactory text of the whole Scriptures in the original languages."

---

ONE of the oldest versions of the Bible, which has as yet been almost neglected, especially in the study of text-critical problems, for which it ought to be extremely useful, is the Ethiopic. Dillmann published the *Octateuchus* and several other historical books of the Old Testament with a good critical apparatus, but for the rest of the Bible nothing was extant except such works as the old edition of the Psalms by Ludolph and the New Testament by Platt. A beginning now is being made with the work of preparing a critical edition of the Ethiopic version of the prophets, Frederick Kramer, having recently, on the basis of Frankfort, Munich and Vienna Manuscripts, published the beginning of the text of Zechariah, with complete prolegomena and commentary, and contemplates the continuation and completion of the undertaking. The Old Testament Ethiopic Bible will be of special interest for LXX studies and these again, in turn, are fundamental for the tremendous task yet awaiting the Old Testament student, namely the text-critical investigation of Moses and the prophets. Praetorius, in his article on Ethiopic Bible in the New (third) Edition of Herzog, has expressed the view that this version was a rendering not of the Hesychius revision of the Septuagint text current in Egypt, but was based on a text introduced into Abyssinia by Aramaic missionaries, which would then exclude the possibility of an Egyptico-Greek basis for this version. Not enough of Zechariah has been published by Kramer as yet to see whether this prophet or the Dodeka prophets will confirm or disprove this hypothesis. The close study of the Ethiopic Old Testament will influence ma-



terially the ups and downs of Septuagint textual investigations.

---

IN two recent meetings of the Paris Academy of Inscriptions the Orientalist Henzey discussed the details of the excavations made by de Savzec in southern Babylonia. On the basis of these researches it is the opinion of Henzey that we have a fixed chronology as early as the fortieth century before Christ. This was based upon his calculation that it was the year 3757 B. C. in which the Nabunahid cylinder sets the reign of Naramsin, the son of Sargon. This date is usually regarded as only a probable conclusion, as Nabunahid only says that Naramsin ruled 3200 years before his time, but the speaker considers it as a fixed and settled date, as he is of the opinion that the writer in question had a sufficient basis for his statement in a wealth of inscriptive and other ancient sources at his command. The place where de Savzec made his examinations was Tello, the ancient Sirpula. This place was probably favorable for the study of the development of brick making among the Babylonians from the very beginning of this art. It appears that the earliest were handmade and impressions were made in them with the thumb; later this sign was supplanted by marks made by a stamping utensil containing the stamp of Sirpula, namely an eagle and the head of a lion. Later on the names of kings were added and in this way certain remnants are shown to have originated in the days of the kings Ur-nina and Fannadu. Among other structures, a large corn storehouse was built of such handmade brick, the plan of which was restored by Savzec. One of the evidences showing that this type of building belongs to this very early date is seen in this that they are found only in localities that had before never been used or cultivated. Henzey also discussed a number of drinking goblets, one with the inscription "Scribe of the Office of the Grain Measurer," also found among the remains of this period. In the Louvre there are other specimens of this kind and class, all of which are dedicated to the local goddess of Sirpula. They are all made of a kind of onyx known as the "Oriental" or Egyptian Alabaster or also Algerian onyx marble, which fact Henzey regards as another evidence of the close connection that at an early date existed between the civilization of Egypt and that of Babylonia, especially when it is re-

membered that onyx drinking cups of exactly the same kind and pattern are found among the oldest ante-pyramid age of Egyptian archæology also.

---

THE CATHOLICS OF GERMANY.—The forty-seventh National Convention of Catholics held in Bonn recently presents an exceptionally vivid picture of the ideas and ideals that control the Catholics of Germany. Special efforts were made to secure an exceptionally large attendance, and in this the Berlin "Germania" and the Cologne "Volkszeitung," the two leading Catholic political papers of the fatherland, together with their hosts of minor satellites, were entirely successful. As a special inducement the announcement was made that the local committee would take out an accident insurance to the extent of 4,000 marks for every individual who attended and 80,000 for all larger companies. In several of the meetings, not only those addressed by the great centrum leader, Dr. Lieber, the audience numbered eight thousand and more. The situation in Rome and the Jesuit law naturally received marked attention, and especially the former was pronounced the leading problem of modern civilization. Several of the speakers declared that a new "Kulturkampf" was on the way but gloried in rather than feared such a contest, declaring that in that historic contest with Bismarck, the Catholics had gained and the Protestant state had lost—something that even Protestants are inclined to acknowledge. Rather remarkable was the open acknowledgment of the scientific inferiority of the Catholic Church as such as compared with the Protestant in Germany. The complaints made before that the Catholics did not receive their share of positions of honor and influence in the state had all along been silenced by the declaration that there was a notable lack of Catholic candidates whose scientific and university attainments entitled them to such positions. One prominent speaker deplored that although the Catholics constitute about one-third of the population, they make only 18.55 per cent of the university enrollment. Dr. Lieber urged the Catholic priests and parents to have young men study not only for the priesthood, but also enter the secular faculties, especially the technical branches in which this inferiority is particularly noticeable. The Görres Society, the Scientific National German Society of Catholic Savants received special encouragement and commendation, and the establishment of special Catholic scientific and technical

schools was regarded as a desideratum, and Catholic reading rooms are to be opened wherever possible for the general church member.

The Bonner convention again emphasized the fact that the Catholics of the fatherland effect their great successes largely through their magnificent organizations. The *Bonifacius Verein*, which labors chiefly for the coreligionists in predominantly Protestant sections, has an annual income of more than a million marks, and has erected many churches, school houses, parsonages, etc. On the other hand a Berlin priest declared that in that city alone, in the last fifty years, the Catholic Church had through so-called "mixed marriages," i. e., marriages of Protestants and Catholics, lost 250,000 souls, that ought to have belonged to this Church. The same speaker declared that the programme must henceforth be: "Germany reunited and one in the old Catholic faith," and for this purpose demands from eight to ten million marks for the Bonifacius Society for the next years. The Catholic *Volksverein*, with a membership of 168,818, is engaged in agitation and publications, having in the past twelve months arranged for 500 Catholic conventions, great and small, and sent out 2,920,000 publications of various kinds. The Catholic laborman's union has a membership of half a million. Dr. Lieber, who last year was sick unto death, thanked the Catholics of Germany for the 6,000 masses which were read for him, and ascribes his almost miraculous recovery to these masses. The convention as such and the various sessions were enthusiastic to a prominent degree. The convention in Bonn has again demonstrated the fact that the Catholics of Germany are constantly carrying a chip on their shoulder.

---

CHURCH EDUCATION IN FRANCE.—The exhibits in the Exposition of Paris have offered some noteworthy material for the study of the educational methods and manners of the *Freres de la doctrine Chritienne*, the great teaching brotherhood of the Catholic Church of France. In the educational department are found a large collection of samples of work done by pupils of this order. Prominent among these is found an essay entitled "A Refutation of Protestantism," written in January of the current year by a boy of fifteen, and by the teacher marked an "excellent account of this important matter." Whether this prominence was assigned to this particular effort intentionally or accidentally, "depo-

nent saith not." This model sample of history from the Brothers schools, reads as follows:

"Protestantism is no religion at all, but is only a rebellion against all religion. It has none of the marks of a religion. It lacks universality in time, in locality, and in the world at large. Protestants are the descendants of Luther and Calvin, or rather of the heretics of the earliest centuries, who were rightly condemned because they decried the teachings of the apostles. Protestantism is unfruitful. Even if England does spend millions for mission work and for the gratuitous distribution of the Bible, yet these mission enterprises avail nothing. All Protestant sects together number only 125,000,000, while the true Catholic Church has more than 250,000,000 adherents. Protestants have no unity. Their religion is based upon free research and everybody interprets the Bible according to his own will. The sects of Protestantism are innumerable, and many are old and comical communities. Protestants do not believe in the divinity of Christ. In their peculiar council of 1873, out of 700 pastors only 300 believed in the divinity of Christ. In Germany all pastors are forbidden to preach on the divinity of Christ. In that country the most learned of the theological professors teach that Jesus Christ never existed. Protestantism destroys the foundation of all morality and makes immorality a fountain head of greatness. It teaches that good works are useless and that all men are from the outset predestinated either to salvation or to damnation. With such a religion no man can fight against himself or cast aside his evil inclinations. He is naturally drawn into the abyss of vice and resigns himself completely to his fate. Protestantism accordingly destroys all moral principles."

With such teachings it is readily understood why the Catholics of France cannot understand or appreciate Protestantism. Yet latest reports show that there are 124 male associations and 392 female associations engaged in teaching under the direction of this order, and France has 35,000 order priests and 125,000 nuns, who teach more than two million children, or at least one-third of the entire youth of the land. Data and facts like these show why clericalism has such a firm hold on France, and why it is that this nation rejoices in the recognition of being the first child of the Church."

EXEGETICAL CRUX.—A very vigorous defense of the traditional punctuation and interpretation of Rom. 9, 5, according to which the close of that verse is not a general doxology and praise of God, but the *Θεός* is predicated of Christ as found in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, No. 8 a. c., from the pen of Lic. Ernst Brose, of Leipzig. The novelty of the attempt in this case lies largely in the new point of view from which a solution of this crux is attempted. Hitherto it was done largely on dogmatical grounds, but not on direct exegetical. Brose attempts to do this on an exegetical basis. He analyses this verse in its connection and from the standpoint of style and grammar, and concludes, largely on the ground of the order of the words and the peculiar functions of the word *ὁ* in this connection, that it is contrary to the spirit of the Greek language to make this a general doxology referring to God. It can only be a predicate of Christ. His argument is largely based on parallel expressions of the N. T. as indicative of the style and manner of New Testament Greek.

Repeatedly efforts have been made to interpret Genesis 1 as a drama, and this conception has found special favor in the works of Roman Catholic theologians, especially in the interests of apologetics. The Jesuit F. Von Hummelaur, has since the seventies been defending this view in a number of works, German and Latin. The fullest expression of his views is found in his Latin commentary on Genesis published in Paris in 1895. Recently again he has defended the proposition in the *Bibel Studien* published by a number of Catholic savants and edited by Professor Bardenhewer (Vol. II, No. 2) in a somewhat modified and more popular form, and in many respects akin to the views of such Protestant scholars as Kurtz, Hugh Miller, and others, who in many particulars have revived the teachings of Herder. Abbè Eck has furnished a French reproduction of Hummelaur's work entitled "Le Récit de la création," and other Catholic theologians, such as Hoberg in Freiburg, and the Jesuit Fonk in Innsbruck, have approved this interpretation. On the other hand a reviewer in the *Revue Biblique*, the well known French organ of learned Catholic theology (1899, No. 2) has rejected the view as entirely too fantastic.

A revision and a reduction of Babylonian chronology by fully a thousand years is proposed by the Orientalist C. L. Lehmann and warmly approved by the historian Ed. Meyer. It is based on the new interpretation of the

orisonplic of Nobonedus, who reports renaming one of his early predecessors, Naram Sin by name, stating that "3200 years ago" he had built a temple to the Sun god Samas at Sippara. On the basis of this statement Naram Sin had been placed in 3750 B. C. and in order to be able to adhere to this, accepted a lacuna of 1,000 years in old Babylonian history. Lehmann claims that the reading of the inscription is a blunder and that it is a serious mistake for 2200 (instead of 3200). According to this then Naram Sin becomes a contemporary of Abraham, and the lacuna of 1,000 years disappears. Cf. Lehmann "*Zwei Hauptprobleme altorientalischer Chronologie und ihrer Loesung.*" Ed Meyer in reviewing this book in the *Lit. Centralblatt* (No. 4), expresses his conviction of the correctness of this solution, and acknowledges that this will make a revision of earlier and earliest Babylonian history necessary.

SUPERSTITIOUS SAYINGS CURRENT IN PALESTINE.—So much of the experience and trend of thought is embodied in the sayings of a people, that the collection of superstitious sayings collected by L. Bauer, a resident of Jerusalem, from the lips of the people of Palestine, is both interesting and instructive. The whole list is published in the *Mittheilungen* of the German Palestine Society, No. 1, from which we make some characteristic selections:

He who dreams of death will have a long life.

A child that does not cry when it is being baptized will soon die.

If two children are baptized at the same time, the one baptized last will not live long.

If your hand itches you will receive money on that day yet.

He who counts the stars of the heavens with raised hands will have warts on his hands.

If a person sees a camel in his dreams, either he or a near relative will soon die.

To see a serpent in one's dream signifies that the dreamer will make a new enemy.

If one person is about to say something, and another at the same time happens to hit upon the same thought, then the second will live longer than the first.

If two ravens fly over your head, you can expect some evil.

If a person whistles over the grain lying on the thresh-

ing floor, the moslems believe that the devil will come during the night and take away some (cf. Hag. i, 9).

If a person steps over the clothes or even the rags of a child that lie on the ground the child will become a cripple.

If on entering a room and removing your shoe, the latter is not put into the proper place, this signifies evil.

A couple that has just been married must not return by the same way that it went to the church, otherwise the husband will soon die.

If during the marriage ceremony, while the priest is pronouncing the blessing, somebody ties a knot in a string, the couple will remain childless.

In the place where the blood of a murdered man has been spilt, a spirit appears every night and repeats the last cries of the unfortunate person.

If a child in a family becomes sick, this has been caused by the envy of somebody and then the fragrance of frankincense will dispel the evil influence. If this is not successful then a handful of salt is to be thrown into the fire and the child held over the hot coals. If a person is pursued by an "evil eye" it is necessary to put a piece of alum into the fire.

THE JOHANNINE PROBLEM.—A noteworthy critical contribution on the Johannine question is found in the *Theol. Literaturblatt*, of Leipzig, No. 39, from the pen of Professor Haussleiter, of the University of Greifswald. Its purpose is to demonstrate that such a person as John, the Presbyter of Ephesus, to whom modern criticism has ascribed the authorship of the fourth gospel, really never existed and the fiction of such a person resulted from a corruption in the text of Papias. It is well known that the whole theory of a Presbyter John is based upon a citation from Papias as found in Eusebius's *Hist. Eccles.*, III, 39, 5 and 6. Here Papias says that if at any time one came to him who had associated with the "Elders," he asked them concerning the words of the "Elders," what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philipp or what Thomas, or what James or what John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord said, and what Aristeon and the "Elder" John, the prophets of the Lord, said. "It appears from this connection that the word *πρεσβύτεροι* is here a title given to the apostles as Eusebius shows soon after in III, 39, 7, where in reporting the same facts the Church historian substitutes the word "apostles." Rufinus, too, in:

his translation, uses the word "apostolos." The Church father does not aim in this passage to contrast apostles with non-apostles; but the contrast lies between the two names in the last report, viz., Aristeon and John. Both are younger than the Lord, but the title "Elder," given in the preceding portion to the apostles is here assigned only to John. In other words, the Presbyter John is nobody else than the Apostle John. This is what the sentence says when interpreted in its own light. This John was a contemporary of Papias when the latter was conducting his investigations. Then, however the name "John" must be a gloss in the first half of the sentence; as Papias could not have twice mentioned the same name, once as that of a dead and the other time as that of a living man, but in fact it can readily be shown that the words ἡ τῶν Ἰωάννης in the first part have all the appearance of a later addition. Papias is given in the shape of rhetorical parallels of two names each his authorities, closing with ἡ τῶν ἑτερος. He mentions, however, only three complete by name, namely, Andrew and Peter; Philipp and Thomas; James and Matthew. The spirit of the whole is spoiled by the addition of the name of John at this place. This name was doubtlessly added by a later hand, and that not without reason, based upon the controversies of the time, especially of the so-called Alogoi, who denied the Joannine authorship of the fourth gospel. Haussleiter gives in detail his explanation of the why and how of this later interpolation.



# THE TEACHERS' ANNUAL

FOR THE YEAR 1900.

The Sunday School Lessons for the whole year explained in language within the grasp of every teacher. The author's object is to make the text of the lessons plain. A faithful use of the "Annual" will richly repay anyone, whether teacher or not.

Price, in substantial board binding, per copy, 75 cents. In lots of six or more, 60 cents per copy, payable in advance. Postage 7 cents extra.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY DR. F. W. STELLHORN,

Professor of Theology in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

A popular treatise on the four Gospels. For study and devotion. Gives the meaning of the text, the history of prominent persons mentioned in the gospels, the topography, all in a clear and distinct manner. The highest praise has been bestowed upon this Commentary by able and competent critics.

Plain Cloth, \$2.00; Half Leather, \$2.50; Morocco, \$3.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY

OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

BY HEINRICH SCHMID, D. D.

A TEXT-BOOK. The Lutheran Doctrine in a clear, distinct and comprehensive form.

Bound Durably in Elegant Cloth, \$4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

---

## THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIES

Pastors and Teachers and Professors will find it to their advantage to consult the general Catalogue of the Lutheran Book Concern before purchasing what they need for their libraries. It cannot be expected that all the books mentioned could be kept constantly on hand, but the assurance can be given that all orders will be promptly attended to.

---

## CHURCH RECORDS

Every congregation should keep a complete record of all the pastoral acts and other important events occurring in the congregation. To this end *Church Records* are a necessity. The LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN has them for sale at \$3.75.

---

**ALL IN ONE VOLUME** are the works of able and competent authors on Theological and Practical Subjects, covering a large field. We have bound volumes of the COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, from 2 to 19, bound durably in half roan at \$2.00 per volume. Order complete set and we will furnish same at \$1.50 per volume.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.